

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
JONES, CLAUDE E.—Contributors to 'The Critical Review' 1756-1785,	433
HATCHER, ANNA G.—Twilight Splendor, Shoe Colors, Bolero Brilliance,	442
MARSH, P. M.—From "Ezekiah Salem" to "Robert Slender," the Pseudonymic Creations of Peter Zenger and Philip Freneau,	447
ADLER, ALFRED.—A Note on the Amazons in 'Anseÿs de Mes,'	451
WEINBERG, BERNARD.—A False First Edition of Amyot's Plutarch,	454
FAY, ELIOT G.—Saint Exupéry in New York,	458
LEARY, LEWIS.—Thomas Day on American Poetry: 1786,	464
GREENE, DAVID H.—An Adequate Text of J. M. Synge,	466
SHAYER, CHESTER L.—A Wordsworth-Pope Parallel,	467
JONES, JOSEPH.—The "Duke's" Tooth-Powder Racket: A Note on 'Huckleberry Finn'	468

REVIEWS:—

C. R. ANDERSON and Others (eds.), <i>The Centennial Edition of Sidney Lanier</i> . [S. T. Williams.]	469
W. J. BATE, <i>The Stylistic Development of Keats</i> ; J. R. CALDWELL, <i>John Keats' Fancy</i> . [Ernest Bernbaum.]	475
Elizabethan Studies and Other Essays in Honor of George F. Reynolds. [J. E. Hankins.]	478
RENÉ PINTARD, <i>Le Libertinage érudit dans la première moitié du XVIII^e siècle</i> ; La Mothe Le Vayer, Gassendi, Guy Patin. [Mary E. Storer.]	481
NATHAN EDELMAN, <i>Attitudes of Seventeenth-Century France toward the Middle Ages</i> . [H. C. Lancaster.]	484
MARIE-LOUISE DUFRENOY, <i>L'Orient romanesque en France 1704-1789</i> . [Emile Malakis.]	485
F. W. LINDSAY, <i>Dramatic Parody by Marionettes in Eighteenth Century Paris</i> . [H. C. Lancaster.]	496
M. H. FAYER, <i>Gide, Freedom and Dostoevsky</i> . [Carlos Lynes, Jr.]	488
R. R. BEZZOLA, <i>Les origines et la formation de la littérature courtoise en Occident (500-1200)</i> . [Sidney Painter.]	490
IAN MAXWELL, <i>French Farce and John Heywood</i> . [Grace Frank.]	492
SAMUEL SINGER (ed.), <i>Mittelhochdeutsches Lesebuch</i> . [Arno Schirokauer.]	494
AGNES STANSFIELD, <i>Hölderlin</i> . [Ernst Feise.]	496
CORRESPONDENCE: The State of Linguistics: Crisis or Reaction? Zu Goethes "Kriegserklärung." A Note on Lyly's <i>Midas</i> , II. Housman and Isaiah,	497

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER
RAYMOND D. HAVENS
KEMP MALONE

C. S. SINGLETON
CHARLES R. ANDERSON
DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas,
Arno Schirokauer, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RE.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

A GENERAL INDEX

TO VOLUMES FIFTY-ONE TO SIXTY OF

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

1936-1945

Compiled by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER and H. H. SHAPIRO is now published. The Index is divided into three parts: Subjects; Authors of Articles and of Books Reviewed; and Reviewers.

viii + 136 pages, 8vo, paper \$2.75

The General Index to Volumes One to Fifty published in 1935, priced \$5.00, is still obtainable.

Orders may be sent to the publisher

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE 18

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXI

NOVEMBER, 1946

Number 7

CONTRIBUTORS TO *THE CRITICAL REVIEW* 1756-1785

The Critical Review, begun in 1756 as Tory competitor to Ralph Griffiths' *Whig Monthly*, is one of the most interesting of Eighteenth Century literary periodicals because of its impressive list of known contributors and the length of its career. Unfortunately, neither of the marked copies¹ has been located, so we are not as well informed concerning the *Critical* personnel as we are of the *Monthly*'s.²

There are, obviously, disadvantages in attempting to ascribe authorship of articles in a periodical which prided itself, as did its rival, on the anonymity of its contributors. In such case, ascriptions must for the most part be suggested rather than definitively stated. The following list of editors and contributors of the *Critical Review* during its first thirty years, while obviously not complete, is, I hope, accurate as far as it goes.

BRAND, CHARLES.

His letter, with the comments of a reviewer, appears in XLI (Feb., 1776), 160-168.

C.

May be William Cooke, Greek Professor at Cambridge, whose edition of Aristotle's *Poetics* appeared in 1785. "C"'s review is:

Aristotle *De Poetica*. LI (April, 1781), 271-273.

C., T.

Signs one review:

The Sham Beggar. I (June, 1756), 483.

¹ See *sub* Hamilton and Robertson.

² Cf. Nangle, Benjamin Christie, *The Monthly Review, First Series, 1749-1789, Indexes of Contributors and Articles*. Oxford, 1934.

CAMPBELL, JOHN.

In November, 1762, Boswell wrote in his Journal that Francklin (*q. v.*) and Campbell were writers on the *Critical*.³ This seems probable, inasmuch as the latter worked with Smollett on the *Modern Part of the Universal History* in 1760. Campbell may be the person referred to in a letter from Hamilton quoted in the article on Smollett in Chambers' *General Biographical Dictionary*:

Paunceford [in *Humphrey Clinker*] was a John C-1. . . .

At the request of Smollett, Mr. Hamilton employed him to write in the *Critical Review*, which, with Smollett's charity, was all his support previously to his departure for India.

No articles have been identified as Campbell's.

F., W.

Signs one review:

Rowe, John. *Introduction to the Doctrine of Fluxions*. 2d ed. vii (March, 1759), 259.

FERGUSON, JAMES.

According to the statement of the editors,⁴ the following may be attributed to Ferguson:

Review of Kennedy, John. *A Complete System of Astrological Chronology*. xv (May, 1763), 329-343.

A letter to Mr. Kennedy. xv (June, 1763), 409-421.

A letter to Mr. Kennedy. xvi (Oct., 1764), 339-352.

FORSTER, JOHN (OR JOHANN).

Forster's biographer in *DNB* writes, "He was employed . . . when in England, in the *Critical Review*. . . ." No *Review* articles have been ascribed to him.

FRANCKLIN, THOMAS.

Noyes suggests⁵ that Francklin may have been one of the original editors. William Courtney, in *DNB*, says that he "was one of the contributors to the *Critical Review*" and that "one of his victims in the *Critical Review* was Arthur Murphy." He may be the person referred to by the editors, in December, 1757, as "a gentleman at Cambridge."⁶ Boswell

³ *Private Papers of James Boswell from Malahide Castle*. 1 (Mt. Vernon, New York; 1928), p. 127.

⁴ xv (June, 1763), 409-421.

⁵ *The Letters of Tobias Smollett*. ed. Edward S. Noyes. (Cambridge, Mass.; 1926), p. 148.

⁶ iv, 552.

names⁷ him as a *Critical* writer in November, 1762. No articles have been identified as his.

GOLDSMITH, OLIVER.

It is uncertain just when Goldsmith began to work for the *Critical*. He may have been connected with the review before he established himself as writer on the *Monthly*, but this is unlikely. His biographers agree that he met Hamilton in 1757, and soon thereafter left the Griffiths household with a low opinion of the proprietor of the *Monthly*. After one review for the *Critical*, they say, he severed relations with that journal also, but resumed work under Smollett in January, 1759. Since his last review appears in March, 1760, he probably devoted most of his attention immediately thereafter to the *British Magazine*, on which he also worked with Smollett. An essay by Goldsmith appears in the *Monthly* for October, 1763, three and a half years after he left the *Critical*, and during the period of Johnson's (*c. v.*) known contributions to the latter journal. In addition to the reviews accredited to Goldsmith, his original plan for the posthumous *History of the Earth* is included in a review of that work in November, 1774.⁸ The reviews attributed to Goldsmith are as follow:

Massy, William. Tr. Ovid's *Fasti*. iv (Nov., 1757), 402-404.

Marriott, Thomas. *Female Conduct*. vii (Jan., 1759), 26-30.

Barrett, Stephen. Tr. Ovid's *Epistles*. vii (Jan., 1759), 31-39.⁹

Spenser, Edmund. *Fairy Queen*, ed. Ralph Church. vii (Feb., 1759), 103-106.

Langthorne, John. Tr. Bion, *The Death of Adonis*. vii (March, 1759), 260-263.

de Gouget, President. *De l'Origine des Loix, des Arts, et des Sciences*. vii (March, 1759), 208.

Ward, John A. *A System of Oratory*. vii (April, 1759), 319.

Murphy, Arthur. *The Orphan of China*. vii (May, 1759), 334-340.

Formay, J. H. S. *Philosophical Miscellanies*. vii (June, 1759), 397.

⁷ Malahide, I, 127.

⁸ XXVIII, 340-341. This item is apparently unnoticed by Goldsmith scholars. The following attributions were first made by Thomas Wright, who printed the *Critical*; the essays appear in *The Works of Oliver Goldsmith*, ed. Peter Cunningham, vol. iv (London, 1855), pp. [185]ff. See also *New Essays by Oliver Goldsmith*, ed. Ronald S. Crane (Chicago, 1927), pp. xii, xiv, xv, xxxvi.

⁹ But cf. Nichols, John, *Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*, III (London, 1813), p. 346 n., where this is ascribed to Smollett.

- van Egmont, J. A., and John Heyman. *Travels through Part of Europe and Asia Minor*. VII (June, 1759), 504-512.
- Montesquieu. *Miscellaneous Pieces*. VII (June, 1759), 514-516.
- Young, Edward. *Conjectures on Original Composition*. VII (June, 1759), 483-485.
- Butler, Samuel. *The Genuine Remains, in Verse and Prose*. Ed. R. Thyer. VIII (July and Sept., 1769), 1-10, 208-212.
- Marriott, Thomas. *The Twentieth Epistle of Horace Modernized*. VIII (July, 1759), 84-86.
- Jemima and Louisa*. VIII (Aug., 1759), 165-166.
- Guicciardini, Francesco. *The History of Italy*. Tr. A. P. Goddard. 2d ed. VIII (Aug., 1759), 97-102.
- Hawkins, William. *Works*. VIII (Aug., 1759), 97-102.
- [William Hawkins?] *A Review of the Works of William Hawkins*. IX (March, 1760), 213-215.
- Dunkin, William. *An Epistle to the Earl of Chesterfield*. IX (March, 1760), 246-247.

GUTHRIE, WILLIAM.

According to the statement of Percival Stockdale (*q. v.*) Guthrie was employed by Hamilton as chief reviewer of "polite literature." Two reviews have been ascribed to him:

Bryant, Jacob. *Observations on the Poems of Thomas Rowley*. XXIV (July, 1767), 412-426.¹⁰

Boyer, William. *Miscellaneous Tracts*.¹¹

HAMILTON, ARCHIBALD.

Authorities agree that Hamilton founded the *Critical*, although he does not appear on the title page as publisher until the fifth volume.¹² According to Stockdale (*q. v.*), Hamilton was employing writers for the *Review* in 1770. Nichols tells¹³ of a set of the *Critical* which was marked according to Hamilton's directions, with the name of the author of each article. Unfortunately this set has disappeared. There is no evidence that he, like his rival, Griffith, did any writing for his own periodical.

HENRY, JOHN.

His letter to the editors appears, with editorial comment, in October, 1777.¹⁴ A letter from "the authors of the *Critical*

¹⁰ See Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, III, 48 n.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, IV, 35.

¹² The first four volumes read "Printed by R. Baldwin."

¹³ Nichols, John. *Illustrations of the Literary History of the Eighteenth Century*, III (London, 1820), p. 399 n.

¹⁴ XLIV, 316-320.

Review to the Rev. Dr. John Henry, of Edinburgh" appears in the *Journal* in August, 1771.¹⁵

HUME, DAVID.

Hume is credited in the articles themselves with the following reviews:

Wilkie, William. *The Epigoniad*. 2d ed. vii (April, 1759), 323-334.¹⁶

Robertson, William. *The History of Scotland*. vii (Feb., 1759), 89-103.

HUNTER, JOHN.

Hunter's quarrel with Dr. Alexander Munro, of Edinburgh, was carried on in the *Critical*, which, possibly because of Smollett's admiration and friendship for Dr. Hunter, favoured him. Otherwise, no contributions by Hunter have been identified. His letter appears in vi (Oct., 1758), 315-316.

JOHNSON, SAMUEL.

The only connection which Johnson is known to have had with the *Critical* is as author of the three articles listed below, although there is some reason to believe that he may have been identified with the *Review* as early as 1758.

Graham, George. *Telemachus, A Mask*. xv (April, 1763), 314-318.

Grainger, James. *The Sugar-Cane*. xviii (Oct., 1764), 270-277.

Goldsmith, Oliver. *The Traveller*. xviii (Dec., 1764), 458-462.

JONES, GRIFFITHS.

Noyes suggests¹⁷ that Jones may have been one of the early editors of the *Critical*, inasmuch as he was connected later with Goldsmith and Smollett on the *British Magazine*. No contributions in the *Review* have been identified as his.

MACAULAY, GEORGE.

Smollett wrote¹⁸ to Macaulay, in 1759, for a contribution on "painting, statuary, or engraving." Whether he was responsible for any of the articles in this field is, however, unknown.

MALLOCH (or MALLETT), DAVID.

Noyes suggests¹⁹ that Malloch may have been one of the original editors. No articles have been identified as his.

¹⁵ xxxii, 148.

¹⁶ This is in the form of a letter defending Wilkie against what Hume considered an unjust review of the first edition.

¹⁷ *Letters*, pp. 148-149.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 148.

POLWHELE, RICHARD.

The anonymous author of Polwhele's obituary in the *Gentlemen's Magazine*²⁰ states that his subject was a contributor to the *Critical*. None of his articles has been identified, however, and it is probable that he did not write for the *Review* until after 1785.

PRIESTLEY, JOSEPH.

The only contributions which Priestley is known to have made to the *Review* are advertisements for the *Theological Repository* which appear as follows:

LVII (April, 1784), 400.

LIX (Jan., 1785), 80.

R., H.

His letter to the editors appears in iv (Sept., 1757), 280.

ROBERTSON, JOSEPH.

His biographer in the *Gentleman's Magazine* says that Robertson published 2620 articles in the *Critical* between August, 1764, and September, 1785, adding: "I have Mr. Robertson's sett of the *Critical Review* in which he has particularly marked his own articles."²¹ Unfortunately, this set, like the one marked at the direction of Hamilton (*q. v.*) has disappeared. The only review definitely ascribed to him is:

Bowyer, William. *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris* by Dr. Bentley. XLII (Jan., 1777), 174-175.

ROBERTSON, WILLIAM.

The Scottish historian wrote²² to Smollett in 1759, offering to review Lord Kames' *Historical Law Tracts*. Whether he was the author of the review of this work or of any other is unknown.

SEWARD, ANNA.

Her letter concerning Major André appears in LI (April, 1781), 320.

SMOLLETT, TOBIAS.

Smollett seems to have been associated with Hamilton in founding the *Critical*: and in August, 1756, he writes²³ to Dr. Moore that the *Review* is conducted by "four men of

²⁰ LXXII (Feb., 1802), 110.

²¹ LXXII (Feb., 1802), 110.

²² [Benjamin, Lewis] *The Life and Letters of Tobias Smollett* (1721-1771). By Lewis Melville [*pseud.*] (London, 1926), pp. 174-175.

²³ *Letters*, p. 39.

approved abilities." In the following year, he is mentioned²⁴ by a *Critical* writer as "colleague," and is probably the one Scot referred to²⁵ as editor at the time. In this year he writes that he has a "little Irishman" as hack-writer on the *Review*,²⁶ and that he is not responsible for the review of *Douglas*.²⁷ In January, 1758, he states²⁸ that he has done little for the *Critical* "lately" and that he did not review the *Epigoniad*. Again, a reviewer mentions²⁹ him as "colleague." In the following year, Smollett writes to Macaulay (*q. v.*) for a contribution, and tells another correspondent that he is working hard on the *Critical*.³⁰ It appears from a letter³¹ at this time that he had asked his friends in Scotland to contribute to the *Review*. In May of 1758, he published an attack³² on Admiral Knowles which led, in the winter of 1760, to his serving three months in the King's Bench Prison.³³ Early in 1761, however, he is back at work,³⁴ and writes³⁵ that he is not the author of the review of the *Rosciad*. In April, 1762, he tells³⁶ a friend that he is just beginning to make money from the *Critical*: by November of that year Boswell notes³⁷ in his diary, "Smollett . . . writes now very little in the *Critical Review*." In the following year, Smollett says³⁸ that he has written a "great part" of the *Review*. From 1763 to 1765, he is traveling on the Continent, and may be the author referred to³⁹ by one of his colleagues as "absent upon a journey." In 1765, he writes⁴⁰ that he gave up all connection with the journal on leaving England, although he has written a few articles

²⁴ III (June, 1757), 481.

²⁵ IV (Oct., 1757), 333.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 51.

²⁷ *Letters*, p. 46.

²⁸ V (Jan., 1758), 17.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.

³⁰ *Letters*, p. 65.

³¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 60-61. And see Robertson's letter in Benjamin, *op. cit.*, pp. 174-175.

³² V (May, 1758), 438-439.

³³ Cf. Noyes, *Letters*, pp. 57-58; 61-62; 178-179.

³⁴ See *Letters*, pp. 69-70; and Smollett's letter to William Huggins, quoted by L. F. Powell in *JEGP*. XXXIV (Nov., 1936), 189.

³⁵ *Letters*, pp. 69-70.

³⁶ Noyes, "Another Smollett Letter," *MLN*. XLII (April, 1927), 232.

³⁷ Malahide, I, 127.

³⁸ *Letters*, p. 81.

³⁹ XX (Aug., 1765), 167-168.

⁴⁰ *Letters*, p. 96, and notes on pp. 215-216.

since. The editors of the *Critical*, at this time, claim⁴¹ that he has not been connected with it "for several years past," a statement which they were obliged to reiterate⁴² in 1768, because opponents are still attacking him as editor. The only reviews attributed to Smollett with any degree of certainty are as follow:

Rolt, Richard. *History of South America*. I (March, 1756), 97-106.
Knowles, Admiral Sir Charles. *The Conduct of Admiral Knowles on the late Expedition set in a true Light*. V (May, 1758), 475-482.

Grainger, James. Tr. Tibullus *Elegies*. VII (Dec., 1758), 475-482.
Bower, Archibald. *History of the Popes*. IX (March, 1760), 183-192.

The following reviews, as well as the general introductory preface to the *Critical*, are tentatively ascribed to him:

Garrick, David. *Fribbleriad*. XI (June, 1761), 494.
Garrick, David. *Florizel and Perdita*. XIII (Feb., 1762), 157-158.
Smellie, William. *Elements of Midwifery*. XIX (Dec., 1764), 502-509.
The Midwife's Pocket Companion. XX (Sept., 1765), 465-466.
Russel, Thomas. *Elegies*. XXXIII (March, 1767), 225.

STEEVENS, GEORGE.

Nichols says⁴³ of Steevens that "His fertile pen was frequently employed in the *Critical Review*" and that he "played off his artillery against Mr. Jennens both in *Reviews* and newspapers." Lee, in *DNB*, contents himself with observing that Steevens "was an occasional contributor . . . to the *Critical Review*." The only review assigned to him, however, is:

Catalogue of Mr. Capell's Shakespeare.⁴⁴ XLIX (Jan., 1780), 89-80.

STOCKDALE, PERCIVAL.

Percival Stockdale took Guthrie's place in 1770 when the latter died. Although none of Stockdale's articles has been identified, his account, which follows, is the most authentic we have after Smollett leaves the review:

Early in the spring of 1770, Dr. GUTHRIE died;—he was a Scotch gentleman of good abilities; and he had acquired some distinction as an author; he was one of those ill-fated men, who without fortune, and without powerful and effectual friends, depend

⁴¹ XXII (Dec., 1766), 433-444 n.

⁴² XXV (April, 1768), 277.

⁴³ *Anecdotes*, III, 120.

⁴⁴ Which Steevens had compiled. The ascription is made by Nichols in *Illustrations*, I, 836-837.

greatly, for their subsistence, on employment from booksellers. He had written in the *Critical Review*; of which, at that time, the redoubted chieftan, was Mr. HAMILTON; a prosperous and very affluent printer, who lived in Falcon-Court, in Fleet Street. This man called on me, one morning, at my lodgings in holborne;—he acquainted me with the news of GUTHRIE'S death; and offered me the succession to his province in the *Critical Review*; which was that of polite literature. I did not like the offer; but money was indispensably necessary. The payment to the writers in that review was poor; viz: two guineas a sheet:—however, as it was very convenient for me to give some regard to the proposal, I insisted on very manly, and spirited conditions, for one in my circumstances:—I told MR. HAMILTON, that I was willing to enter into the literary department of his review, of which he was so civil as to give me the first offer; provided I should not be obliged to review such books as I did not like to review; and that I should give my free, unobstructed, and in every way, unaltered sentiments on those that I did review. He acquiesced in my terms; and in March, 1770, I first appeared, but under the cover of the master of the sevenfold shield; as an arbiter of the fate of authors.—I proceeded in my censorial office till April of the next year; when I proposed to our general an augmentation of my pay. The boldest dashers of the monthly reviewers, for their unmerited, and capricious protection; and for their dark and inhuman assassinations, were requited by GRIFFITHS, the khan of that horde, with four guineas a sheet. My grand signer met my demand with a positive refusal. My narrow purse was a little more contracted by this rupture; but my heart was enlarged, and played more vigorously.⁴⁵

WATKINSON, EDWARD.

This is evidently the Edward Watkinson of whom Allibone speaks as M. D., Rector of Little Chart, in Kent. His letters to the *Critical* are headed Ackworth, Yorkshire. In May, 1759, the editors thank⁴⁶ him for advice. His one identified contribution is the long critical essay which appears in 6 parts as follows, under the title "An enquiry into the nature and tendency of criticism":

- XI (Preface, 1761), 2-4; xv (March, 1763), 161-167; xvi (July, 1763), 1-5; xvii (Jan., 1764), 1-9; xviii (July, 1764), 1-10; xix (Preface, 1765), 1-10.

CLAUDE E. JONES

University of California, Los Angeles

⁴⁵ *The Memoirs of Percival Stockdale, written by himself* (London, 1808), II, 57-58.

⁴⁶ VII, 470.

TWILIGHT SPLENDOR, SHOE COLORS, BOLERO
BRILLIANCE

Among the innovations in word-formation that have arisen in the technical and official language of our times, one of the types most characteristic of this language is that represented by noun combinations such as *milk scarcity*, *skin condition*, *food value*, *shoe colors*, in which the second noun (B) names some aspect (some quality, condition, situation) of the first noun (A). This general pattern falls into several types:

family unity, child welfare; foot comfort, eye ease; home health, employé morale, pilot efficiency.¹

world situation, supply situation, war position; world problems, production needs, war demands, manpower crisis, transportation difficulties, transportation delays, traffic congestion, production bottlenecks; food scarcity, butter shortage, food surplus; accident frequency.

skirt fullness, sleeve tightness. heart condition, skin condition; stomach distress, tooth decay, body odor.

rouge shades, shoe colors; hat sizes, type sizes, heel heights. figure types, blood types. fighter characteristics, adult psychology.

room temperature, body heat. wing spread; color range, price range. bombing range; rising speed; travel time, flying time, running time; shoe life, style life; ² fighter strength, Army-Navy strength.

waterpower, manpower, womanpower, "boy power"; ³ will power,⁴ brain

¹ In this small group there is a slight shift of emphasis: *family unity* is an ideal condition which must be *assured*; *employé morale* (which may be good or bad) is conceived of as constantly varying and needing to be *reinforced*.

² Here *-life* = 'durability' or 'duration.'

³ Used in reference to the membership of the National Boy Scouts.

⁴ Among the combinations with *-power*, *will power* is unique in that it is based upon an earlier phrase with *of*: *power of will* belonged together with *power(s) of imagination*, *of characterization*, *of concentration*, *of endurance*, all of which have literary and idealistic connotations. But today, thanks to the personality experts who regard 'will power' as an important factor for efficiency, *power of will* has been drawn into the orbit of *waterpower* etc. (it needs only to be written as one word: *willpower*)—and has even led to the creation of a *brain power* (found in an advertisement of a series of streamlined texts).

power, eye power; shoe power; "money power." (200) horsepower, (200) candlepower.⁶ kilowatt inferiority, vitamin deficiency.⁶

tone quality, food quality; food value, nuisance value, entertainment value, propaganda effect; prestige value, cash value, point value; love interest; sex appeal, star appeal, safety appeal.

These examples reflect the commercial, scientific (and pseudo-scientific), sociological, economic aspects of our world today. The condition or aspect which is classified may belong to some general sphere and may represent a factor—often temporary, but on a large scale—with which society must cope (*transportation difficulties*). Or it may be the condition of modern man himself that is involved: his morale, general welfare, and efficiency, considered as a factor (*employé morale, family welfare, pilot efficiency*)—or even the condition of his feet, his teeth, his skin, which our specialists and purveyors of remedies have assumed the responsibility of treating. Again, the classification may be applied to commodities, as a means of evaluation and measurement (*food quality, hat sizes*). It is particularly the 'calculating' tendency which is apparent in the technical expressions of measurement which serve to compute the factors determining efficient accomplishment: *rising speed, running time, water power*; with this last belongs the de-humanized *manpower*: the human, no less than the mechanical, is seen only as a source of energy to be exploited for production. Here, too, we find the commercial *star appeal*, based ultimately upon Havelock Ellis' *sex appeal* (with its emphasis on the efficacy of sex), which would coldly calculate the influence of human charm and grace as a factor in successful movie production. Indeed, the keynote of this type of expression in general is a concern with efficiency and success.⁷

⁶ In these two examples it is clear that a metaphor is involved: *horsepower* is never used of a horse.

⁶ It is evident that in a great many examples of the last two groups, the condition isolated is 'transferred': it is a person who has 'vitamin deficiency,' though, ultimately, it is the vitamins that are deficient. Similarly, *sex appeal* refers to the appeal, derived from sex, which a person enjoys. And *cash value* (unlike *food value*, which refers to food) describes the value of a commodity measured in terms of [the value of] cash etc.

⁷ This is also true of another syntactical pattern I have treated earlier (*MLN*, Jan. 1943, p. 8-17), in which the emphasis was placed even more obviously on efficiency and smooth performance: the use, in advertising, of the 'potential intransitive,' in such examples as "this car *operates, handles*

This pattern of word formation, belonging as it does almost exclusively to the commercial and bureaucratic language, is still, today, greatly limited: we may speak of *skin condition* but not **room condition*; *will power* but not **imagination power*; *Family Welfare* but not **family serenity* (nor would we ever think of the 'running time' of a child at play). According to the examples cited above, it is only when the phenomenon in question is viewed as a social or technical problem with which one must cope, and only when the aspect of that phenomenon is one that can be recognized and isolated as a factor determining (favorably or adversely) efficient functioning, that this procedure of 'classifying an aspect' is resorted to.

Now most of the examples of this utilitarian type are a product of the last decade.⁸ But the logical relationship which they illustrate ("a condition or aspect B is classified as predicable of A") is to be found in noun combinations from the time of OE *gum-cyst* 'man[ly] virtue.' Shakespeare speaks of *vulture folly*, *pale beggar fear*, *idiot laughter*; and the Victorian poets give us such expressions as *city gloom*, *twilight splendor*, *maiden grace* (Tennyson), *corpse light*, *flower smell*, *maiden breath*, *child despair* (Swinburne), *ocean idleness*, *forest gloom*, *valley fatness*, *sea tracklessness* (Browning), *ruffian passion*, *virgin splendor*, *virgin bloom*, *rose bloom*, *pine and cedar gloom* (Keats).

Originally, then, this type of noun combination was an artistic device by which the poet could suggest the crystallisation of an ideal quality, the extraction of an essence: in *twilight splendor* only the essence of 'twilight' is evoked—to color the aspect which has been isolated and which is felt to exist independently, as a substance poetically discerned; indeed, so real is the independence of the quality abstracted that it may be attributed, metaphorically, to a new being (cf. *pale beggar fear*, applied to one not a beggar).

It is, of course, only too obvious that the poetic *twilight splendor* and the commercial *shoe colors*—that Swinburne's *flower breath* and Life Buoy's *body odor* represent two quite distinct inspirations: two treatments, provoked by different needs, of the relation be-

smoothly," "this dress *washes* and *irons* and *packs* easily," "this paint *applies* evenly" etc.

⁸ Obvious exceptions are *waterpower* and *horsepower*, which are attested in the last century.

tween a phenomenon and some aspect thereof. The technical and official types we have been considering do not trace their origin back to a poetic device⁹—nor do they need any 'origin' for their explanation; like many quite new types of noun combination to be found in modern journalism, they have come about simply as the result of an increasing desire to classify, to label (and the formation of compounds is, fundamentally, a classifying procedure)¹⁰ the various aspects, particularly the technical and the social, of modern civilization.

But while the distinction between the evocative *twilight splendor* and the definitive *shoe colors* is absolute, there is a third type which has not yet been considered and which illustrates, in my opinion, the deliberate imitation of the poetic type by commercial writers. Surely *sandal simplicity*, *bolero brilliance*, *ice-cream perfection* and *leg loveliness* are variations on the theme of *twilight splendor*—as are also:

suitdress simplicity, suit smartness, hosiery beauty, scarf beauty, bow beauty, hat elegance, blouse originality, blouse harmony, color excitement, gingham glamor, plaid perfection, pastel perfection, polka-dot perfection. eye glamor, leg glamor, figure perfection, complexion beauty, skin beauty, hand beauty, hair beauty. coffee goodness, cheese goodness.¹¹

For with *bolero brilliance*, *sandal simplicity*, we have no longer to

⁹ The 'accidental' similarity between an earlier poetic pattern and a modern utilitarian use of the same relationship, is frequently to be found with noun combinations: cf. A. S. *wig-craeft* 'battle craft' with modern *combat efficiency*; A. S. *stearc-heort cyning* 'stout-heart[ed] king' (also mod. *barefoot boy*, the only remaining vestige of this poetic type) with *open-toe shoe*; A. S. *werewolf* 'manwolf' with *butler-chauffeur*, *thresher-binder*.

¹⁰ Usually this classifying emphasis is so strong that the compound will designate a particular type with special qualities not specified by the two nouns themselves (*alley cat* vs. *cat in the alley*). But even when the difference between the two constructions is as slight as that existing between *element of time* and *time element*, it is still true that the compound form is more clearly a 'label': the 'time element' becomes merely one in a series of 'elements,' all neatly classified.

¹¹ Even in this cheapening and trivialization of a poetic type we may still distinguish levels of excellence: there is a tastefulness in *sandal simplicity*, a verve in *bolero brilliance*, *polka-dot perfection*, *gingham glamor*—whereas *coffee goodness* and *hand beauty* are flat, and *eye glamor* rather jarring. (*Coffee goodness* etc. would be the 'imitation of an imitation.')

do with a condition that is accidental and temporary (*stomach distress, food surplus*) or with one that may fluctuate, and needs gauging—and can be gauged objectively (*body heat, manpower, wing spread*); instead, just as is true of *twilight splendor*, the aspect that has been discerned (*subjectively* discerned) is inherent and constant: an 'ideal' quality. Here, too, an essence has been extracted: the 'sandal' of *sandal simplicity* exists only to inform the quality with a 'sandal' shape.¹²

It is surely not difficult to imagine that the first copywriter of smart advertising to coin expressions of this type was a young college graduate, who still remembered her sophomore course in "British Poets of the Nineteenth Century" and who (much in the manner of present-day song-writers who borrow from the themes of Tschaiakowsky and Chopin) was inspired to set to jazz the strains of Keats and Swinburne that lingered in her memory.¹³

The self-conscious adaptation of a poetic device for utilitarian purposes, as represented by *sandal simplicity, bolero brilliance*, is, I believe, unique as far as concerns the particular construction of noun combinations.¹⁴ And the fact that such trivialization has

¹² There may be some cases in which it is difficult to distinguish between the quite matter-of-fact utilitarian type and the pseudo-poetic. For example, such phrases as *whiskey taste* or *coffee flavor*, found in advertisements, might seem to belong with the quite objective and technical *fighter characteristics*, but, emotionally, *coffee flavor* etc. is closer to *coffee goodness* (here, 'flavor' and 'taste' are conceived of as ideal: the true, genuine characteristic of goodness). Again, should *color appeal* be placed with the pseudo-poetic *color excitement* (and *gingham glamor*)—or with *safety appeal* (or *sex appeal*—which, though technical and with connotations of 'efficiency,' suggests allure)?

¹³ If *sandal simplicity* is a conscious imitation of the poetic type, while the similarity between *twilight splendor* and *shoe colors* is only accidental, there still exists a third connection possible between an original poetic pattern and a later prosaic development: it may happen that an imaginative expression offers such a convenient means of classification that it becomes gradually drained of its original poetic nuance and comes to be used for utilitarian purposes without the slightest stylistic self-consciousness. This is illustrated, within the relationship we are considering, by such expressions as *carnation red, turquoise blue, eggshell color* etc. This type must have originated as a poetic device (*sea green*, for example, is first found with Spenser), but today it is felt as a quite practical way of designating various shades.

¹⁴ As for other constructions, I might mention the use in advertising of the once-lofty construction: 'instrumental noun + participle': *sun-ripened*,

been the fate of *twilight splendor* reflects our reaction to this poetic type. It is only when a poetic pattern has ceased to inspire the poets that the writers of advertising copy will find inspiration in it. Unlike the poets they cannot wait to create an audience (for they must sell their wares today): they must appeal to what is already familiar, to what of poetry has filtered down to popular levels. And the pattern of *twilight splendor* had already reached this stage (witness such hackneyed phrases, which appear in prose, as "Old World charm," "springtime magic," "holiday air," "fin de siècle atmosphere"). With the appearance of *bolero brilliance* (not to mention "*Maidenform girdles*"), the type has been killed for poetry. But advertising has only given the *coup de grâce* to what was already expiring.

ANNA GRANVILLE HATCHER

The Johns Hopkins University

FROM "EZEKIAH SALEM" TO "ROBERT SLENDER"
THE PSEUDONYMIC CREATIONS OF PETER
ZENGER AND PHILIP FRENEAU

It is a lively possibility that Philip Freneau borrowed the pseudonym "Hezekiah Salem," under which he wrote about a dozen poems and essays, from John Peter Zenger in the *New York Weekly Journal* of 1738 to 1741-2.¹ Freneau's "Salem," in spite of Yankee idiosyncracies like a love of pumpkin beer, dirt, garlic, and bowling, never quite achieves comedy. But Zenger's creation, "Ezekiah Salem," is a hilariously comic personality, sporting a

even *Sunkist* (with the archaic *-t* instead of *-sed*: cf. *heaven-blest*), on which Professor Spitzer has written in a forthcoming article. Indeed, we may find in advertising even an imitation of poetic *punctuation*: the use of 'points of suspension,' once favored by sensationalistic or sentimental English authors (and still greatly in vogue with French writers) flourishes today chiefly in (luxury) advertisements, where it is used to 'sustain the mood' supposedly provoked in the prospective customer as he visualizes himself enjoying the glamorous article advertised: "Suzanne's newest creation—*tout de suite*—perfume for a vibrant moment. . . ."

¹ P. M. Marsh, "Freneau's 'Hezekiah Salem,'" *The New England Quarterly*, XVIII, 256-259 (June, 1945).

mock melancholy that covers a checkered career and a rollicking story.

As "Nahab Din," Zenger presented his deceased hero October 15, 1738, with a poem called "Salems Complaint. Hymn the XVIII," and this introductory note addressing the editor:

As many of the performances of my well beloved Friend *Ezekiah Salem*, have been Joyfully received by the Publick, I beg you would do his memory the Honour to insert his XVIII Hymn. . . .

In spite of the ostensibly lengthy career of this poet, as far as known copies of the *Journal* are concerned, "Hymn XVIII" seems to be his first and last performance:

When I consider my Disgrace,
And cast Reflections on my Case;
How many Woe's I've undergone,
By great and small impos'd upon,
Dispis'd, Abus'd, and made a Sport,
In City, Country, Town and Court,
I can't but vent my Grief in Sighs,
And ease my Breast with streaming Eyes.
O SALEM! Football to the World,
How hast thou round the Globe been hurld.
Nay been the common constant Play,
Of the Sedate, Fantastic Gay,
And bladder like, now here then there.
Been bounced about then God knows where.
The Winds delight the Waters hate,
Earths Vagabond and Fires fate.
Belov'd by none and fear'd by all,
Th'unlucky prey of each I fall.
Yet Jove, be praised, there are no more,
Of Elements but Cruel four;
For there were Twenty I believe,
At me each one would have a heave.
The Rich Man's Scorn the Wise Mans Fool,
The good Man's Dread the Critics Bull.
The Drunkards Post, Parents Denial,
Good Cheors *goby*, and Physicks Tryal.
The Parson's Atheist Misers Curse,
And Infants Terrour Chosen by the Nurse.

On the following January 15 (1738-9), "Nahab Din" again submitted a poem, this by "Rebecca Salem," the wanderer's wife, probably a vain appeal to bring him home:

A Letter from *Rebecca Salem* in the Country to her Husband in Town.

By what I know and ye perceive,
We still in natural Friendship live;

. . .

Then since our lives so well agree,
And rol[1] in blest Felicity,
Why wilt thou be forever from,
Thy much lamenting Spouse at home?

. . .

O *Salem*! let me no more begg,
Bid Love give motion to thy Leg;
Fly, fly, as if to save thy Life,
And virtue of a loving Wife,
Who doubtfull of thy Dear return,
In other Arms consent to mourn.

. . .

Grant that these Lines be not invain,
But bring thee to thy home again,
From her whom those nor none can say,
Hath Cuckold thee in any Way.

REBECCA SALEM.

Contributions from "*Rachel Salem*," the "*Second Son of Salem*," and the "*Sixth Son of Salem*" also appeared in the *Journal* about this time. Then, after an obscene answer "*To the House of Salem*" (March 1, 1741-2), the whole business was abruptly dropped, perhaps because of complaints.

The creator of "*Ezekiah Salem*" was evidently Editor Zenger, he of the famed trial for the freedom of the press. In an editorial comment by "*Nahab Din*," a reference is made to inserting a contribution "*in my Journal*."² As "*Nahab Din*," it seems that Zenger stirred up a whole nest of other "*Salems*" wishing to join the family squabbles. The resulting entertaining nonsense was a part of the widespread American imitation of the popular *Spectator* essays, occasional numbers of which were reprinted in Zenger's *Journal*, as in other colonial newspapers.

In character, there is little resemblance in Freneau's "*Hezekiah Salem*" to Zenger's creation. But it is possible that Freneau borrowed the pseudonym, and used the character to satirize the

² April 16, 1738.

Yankees—in essays in his New York *Time-Piece* (October-November, 1797). His use of the pen-name with poems occurs in a few items from his 1809 edition of *Poems*, but without much textual significance. There is more resemblance in his “Robert Slender,” a pseudonymic character not unlike “Ezekiah,” a melancholy wanderer also tired of life, and critical of the world. “Slender” first appeared, like “Ezekiah,” deceased, having left manuscripts that could be conveniently published. In pamphlet form, Freneau published *A Journey from Philadelphia to New-York . . . By Robert Slender* (Philadelphia, 1787), a rather comic poem whose first lines are reminiscent of Zenger and “Ezekiah”:

Tormented with critics, and pester'd with care,
This life, I protest, is a tedious affair;
Through many long years, it has still been my doom
To sit like a Mopus, confin'd to my loom,
Whose damnable clatter so addles my brain,
That, say what they will, I am forced to complain.

“Slender” was a stocking weaver and a poet who had died lamenting the lack of opportunity for writers in America. The next year, in *Miscellaneous Works*, he reappeared as an essayist mildly satirical of life and people. More than a decade later, in the Philadelphia *Aurora* of 1799 to 1801, and in a 1799 volume, *Letters . . . by Robert Slender*, Freneau presented a new “Slender,” a cobbler who wrote political essays—still wary of life and humanity, but, unlike his predecessor, very much married. His last appearance seems to have been in the *Aurora* of August 25, 1814, in a serious plea for votes. “Hezekiah Salem’s” last appearance seems to have been as a character in Freneau’s poem, “Elijah, the New England Emigrant,” in the *Trenton True American* for November 3, 1821,³ as an eccentric Yankee deacon.

The line of connection is tenuous. Yet there appears to be one of sorts. The long residence of the Freneau family in New York, where Philip was born in 1752, and where his father had lived from his own birth in 1718 to 1753, must have provided family memories of the city’s journalistic annals. In these, the name of Zenger was famous; and the custom of preserving newspaper files for generations probably provided an attic-ful of material for

³ Lewis Leary, *That Rascal Freneau* (New Brunswick, N. J., 1941), p. 352.

poems and essays that the boy poet would pore over. And "Hezekiah Salem" is hardly the sort of pseudonym to come to a writer out of the blue. How much more than the pseudonym Freneau may have learned from Zenger is sheer conjecture.

PHILIP M. MARSH

Miami University

A NOTE ON THE AMAZONS IN *ANSEÏS DE MES*

A whole army composed of women, who, fighting on the side of the Bordelais, decided the outcome of the fateful battle of Santerre,—this comparatively unusual theme constitutes one of the episodes of *Anseïjs de Mes*.¹ In addition to analogues for the theme of fighting women in French epics mentioned by Th. Krabbes,² Dr. Green, the editor of *Anseïjs de Mes*, quotes, for an account of a battle in the *Chanson d'Antioche*, an *échelle* made up of women, for *Mort Aymeri*, the army of women recruited in Femenie, and an episode from the German *Kaiser-chronik*.³ Left unmentioned, yet specifically relevant for the episode in *Anseïjs*, is a legend reported by J. Bédier in his discussion of *Gormond et Isembard*.⁴ According to the later version of Gormond's death preserved in the *Chronique Rimée* of Philippe Mousket,⁵ the battle of Cayeux (transferred to Amiens) would have been lost by the French, had it not been won by the ladies of Amiens:

Mais ja ne fussent desconfi
Li Sarrasin, jou sai de fi,
Quant les dames ki norisoient

¹ Publ. according to MS N (Bibliothèque de L'Arsenal 3143) by H. J. Green (Paris 1939), vss. 5 8 5 2 ff., and 8 5 8 1 ff.

² *Die Frau im altfranzösischen Karlsepos* (Marburg, 1884), p. 49. He quotes from *Gaufrey* and *Aliscans*.

³ *Anseïjs* (ed. Green), p. 46, and *ibid.*, analogues to one of the women in *Anseïjs*, who works havoc with a *mace* (vss. 8718-25). To Professor Grace Frank I owe an additional reference to Amazon tradition in *Aucassin et Nicolette* (ed. Suchier, 10th ed.), p. 53, and bibliography there.

⁴ *Légendes Épiques*, IV, 2nd ed., 21-91. See especially p. 82. n. 2.

⁵ *Chronique Rimée de Philippe Mousket*, ed. Reiffenberg (Bruxelles 1838), II, vss. 14275-87 (p. 82). Italics added.

Lor enfançons et alaitoient,
 Des François que tant mors i virent
 Hiaumes, escus, obiers vestirent
 Si que lor lais ès grans batailles
 Lor dégoutoit parmi les malles.
 Encor i pert, savoir ne fal,
 Ès cans c'on dist Molleron-val
En la contrée d'Aminois.
 As paiens fissent moult d'anois.
Par eles fu vengus li cans, . . .

In *Loher und Maller*, the other later account of Gormond's death, the outcome of the battle is reported in a very similar manner, with the addition that the statues of the women of Amiens were put up in the cathedral of Amiens, to the right, not to the left side.⁶ A mural inscription of 1582 in the cathedral of Amiens reads: A victoria Vallis mulierum per matronas Ambianenses DCXXXVI.⁷ The *Anonyme de Béthune* reports the same tradition:

Mais nonporquant toz i fust desconfist Looys, se ne fust por les dames d'Amiens qui le secourant et venquirent la bataille. Et por ce sont eles encore, en l'église Notre Dame d'Amiens a destre [as in *Loher und Maller*], et li home a senestre.⁸

Bédier's main interest in this legend consists in the reference to Amiens, a city in the vicinity of which he locates the origin of *Gormond et Isembard*.⁹ As for *Anseÿs de Mes*, its episode of the fighting women offers striking similarities to the legend in Philippe Mousket. Ludie and her Amazons break forth from Amiens. Amiens is mentioned eight times as their basis of operation (vss. 5852, 5854, 6133, 6346, 8237, 8607, 8641, 8835), and Aminois, the country around Amiens, four times (vss. 6235, 6718, 6783, 7466).

⁶ *Loher und Maller*, Ritterroman, erneuert von K. Simrock (Stuttgart 1868), p. 278.

⁷ Q. L. Deslisle, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits*, xxxv, 369-70. The inscription is to be found in Bibliothèque Nationale, coll. Balluze, V. 141, fol. 20^{vo}.

⁸ Q. L. Deslisle, *op. cit.*, p. 368. Italics and brackets added. See also Nicolas d'Amiens, *Auctuarium*, *MGScr.*, vi, 474, and Ph. Lauer, "Louis IV d'Outre-Mer et le fragment d'Isembart et Gormont," *R.*, vi (1897), 166, and F. Lot, "Gormont et Isembart," *R.*, xxvii (1898), 7.

⁹ "Saint Riquier, Saint-Valéry, Cayeux: le Fragment de Bruxelles nous confine sur ce petit territoire, du diocèse d'Amiens. Les versions plus récentes, sans en sortir, se bornent à transférer de Cayeux à Amiens la bataille ou périt Gormond." (J. Bédier, *Légendes Épiques*, iv, 82.)

As in the legend, the women are clad in armour. Ludie looks like Fromont. (vs. 8670). Fourquerés himself, one of the Bordelais, "A un fame a demandé a pris, Quida ce fust uns de lor fervestis" (vss. 8689-90). As in the legend, the battle seemed lost to the side on which the women were going to take part (vss. 8540 ff.). Then, the women appear (vss. 8560 ff.) with the result that, "Les dames ont vaincu l'estor plenier" (vs. 8884). In the legend, the women fight on the side of the French, against the infidels. In *Anseÿs*, the women are on the side of the Bordelais, the party supported by the Church, by Saint Ligier and four other churchmen (vss. 5026 ff.), whereas their opponents, the Loherains and Pépin, have fallen from grace. After the battle, Pépin is told by Saint Ligier: "Saches de voir, tu en seres peris" (vs. 8964), and of the Loherain Gerin, Saint Ligier says, "qu'assez est pires, voir que ne fu Kayns" (vs. 8969).

Interesting as an analogue to the legend of Amiens, the episode of the fighting women in *Anseÿs* seems to support Bédier's claim that the diocese of Amiens played some role in *Gormond et Isembard*. Furthermore, although not mentioned in the older branches of the *Geste des Loherains*, in *Garin, Mort Garin, Girbert* and *Yon*, Gormond and Isembard are mentioned in *Anseÿs*,¹⁰ and specifically, in connection with the battle of Santerre. Saint Ligier exhorts Bauche, the leader of the Bordelais, not to endanger the land by warfare. Otherwise, "Li rois Germons . . ." (vs. 5073) will overrun the impoverished country. After a long account describing the evil omens which occurred before the meeting of the armies at Santerre, there follows a prophecy of dire events to come such as, "Puis vint en France . . . , Germon. Pour lui vengier amena grant foison. Ses a conduis Yzembars, le baron" (vss. 6468-70). These two references are given in the context of the account of the battle won by the women who came from Amiens. Although there is no agreement as to whether *Gormond et Isembard* was actually created in the territory of Amiens,¹¹ or only adapted there,¹² it seems noteworthy that *Anseÿs* with its episode analogous

¹⁰ Cf. R. S. Bowman, *The Connections of the Geste des Loherains with other French Epics and Mediaeval Genres* (New York, 1940), pp. 103, 106-108, 140.

¹¹ This is Bédier's view. See note (9) above.

¹² This is the view of F. Lot, *R*, LIII, 325-342.

to the legend which has been elaborated in the later versions of *Gormond et Isembard*, mentions both Gormond and Isembard in the very context, and there only, in which it tells the episode of the victory of the Amazons of Amiens.

ALFRED ADLER

Central Michigan College

A FALSE FIRST EDITION OF AMYOT'S PLUTARCH

In a recent attempt to establish the text of Amyot's dedicatory epistle and preface to his translation of Plutarch's *Vies des hommes illustres*, I discovered that two copies purporting to be the first edition of 1559 were entirely different, the copy at the Library of Congress (PQ 1601.A6 1559) and the copy at Princeton University. The problem remained of discovering which of these was the genuine first edition.

It soon became clear that the copy at the Library of Congress is authentic. This copy agrees in every detail with the descriptions of the first edition as given by Van Praët, *Catalogue des livres imprimés sur vélin de la Bibliothèque du roi* (Paris: De Bure Frères, 1822, V, 49-50) and by the Rothschild Catalogue, Vol. III, No. 2735, where the copy described once belonged to Amyot himself. By way of additional control, and because comparison with another 1559 copy was not possible, a study was made of a group of works in-folio printed by the same printer, Michel de Vascosan, during the same years (1554-1560). The following features, mostly present in the preliminary materials under investigation, were singled out for study:

- (a) The ornamental headpiece preceding the dedication;
- (b) The historiated capital C at the beginning of the dedication;
- (c) The historiated capital L at the beginning of the preface "Aux Lecteurs";
- (d) The paper. The copy at the Library of Congress presents two watermarks: an armorial crest almost identical with Briquet No. 1121, "30 x 42. *Châtel-Censoir*, 1552. A. Yonne, G. 2265: *Cptes du chapitre*"; and a capital B.

Examination of these other works by Vascosan, all in the New-

berry Library, disclosed the presence of all these features in other impressions of the same period:

1554: *Arnoldi Ferroni Bvrdigalen. Regii Consilarii, De Rebus Gestis Gallorum Libri X.* Lvtetiæ, Ex officina typographica Michaëlis Vascosani, uia Iacobæa ad insigne Fontis. M. D. LIIII. (The various watermarks include the capital B, but surmounted by a small flower; the type similar if not identical.)

1558: *Pavli Iovii Novocomensis Episcopi Nucerni, Historiarum svi temporis tomus primus . . .* Lvtetiæ Parisiorum, ex officina typographica Michaelis Vascosani [etc.]. M. D. LVIII. (The ornamental headpiece used at the head of various books, e.g. fol. [d ij v]; the historiated capital L used fol. q. of Vol. I. The headpiece also used in Vol. II. In both vols., the capital B watermark appears, in the same size and in a smaller size than the Congress copy; also the armorial crest, but without the small flower above, in Vol. II, fols. [MM vij, MM viij].)

1559: *L'Histoire de Thucydide Athenien, De la guerre qui fut entre les Peloponnesiens & Atheniens, Translatee de Grec en François par feu Messire Claude de Seyssel . . .* A Paris, De l'imprimerie de Michel de Vascosan. M. D. LVIII.

(Headpiece used, fol. A, at the beginning of the "Premier Livre" and at other places. Historiated C on fol. [a v] of the Prologue; historiated L on fol. [Y vi v], at the beginning of the "Cinquieme Livre." Capital B watermark in various places in the latter part of the volume, variously placed on the page and frequently reversed as in the Congress copy.)

1560: *Henrici II. Galliarum Regis Elogium . . . Petro Paschali Avtore.* Lvtetiæ Parisiorum, apud Michaëlem Vascosanum. M. D. LX.

(Watermarks include the capital B, but with the small flower surmounting it, and the armorial crest exactly as in the Congress copy, e.g. fol [5] of the *Tumulus*, one of the constituent parts of the work.)

These volumes furnished conclusive additional evidence, if any was needed, that the Library of Congress volume was closely related to other impressions of Vascosan in the same period, and was presumably the authentic first edition.

On the other hand, the Princeton copy of the Amyot Plutarch was immediately suspect, not only because it differed radically in pagination, type, and ornamentation from the Congress copy, but also because of certain physical and internal features. (1) The volume does not contain the *privilege* and the *achevé d'imprimer*

belonging to the first edition; no colophon of any kind is present.

(2) The title page is on a paper different from that used throughout the volume and from that of the conjugate; it bears a watermark consisting of a fleur-de-lis above two lozenge-shaped figures, below which are the letters I R (?), whereas the watermark through the rest of the volume presents a stem at the top of which is a diamond crossed internally and at the bottom of which is an X.

(3) The title page shows evidence of mutilation. There are several fairly large patches. Below the title (which agrees in all respects with that on the title page of the Congress copy, but is different in type and spacing) one may read the words "par Iaques Amyot" which were once printed (by hand or by press?) in a place where the author's name might be expected to appear, but which have since been removed mechanically or chemically, leaving their outlines in a lighter tone on the paper. (4) The orthography of the text, in spite of the danger of generalizing about such matters in the sixteenth century, would seem to represent a later period in spelling; *droict* in the 1559 copy is spelled *droit* in the Princeton, etc.

It seemed clear, then, that the Princeton copy represented some later edition, with its own title page and colophon removed and a false title page of unknown provenance substituted. This is a very beautiful edition in itself, with extraordinary historiated capitals, fine headpiece and tailpiece ornaments, an elegant type face, and generally excellent workmanship; but it is not the first edition. The problem remained of determining what edition it is.

The first line of investigation, that it might be the "contrefaçon . . . faite à Anvers" mentioned by Louis Clément in his edition of the lives of *Périclès et Fabius Maximus* (Paris: Droz, 1934), pp. vii-viii, and by René Sturel, *Jacques Amyot traducteur des vies parallèles de Plutarque* (Paris: Champion, 1908), p. 109, led to no results.

The clue was found in an examination of materials on sixteenth-century printing which might contain one or more of the ornamental features found in the preliminaries of the Princeton copy. The composite-block tailpiece at the end of the dedication (fol. A iij) was found in Stanley Morison's *Four Centuries of Fine Printing*, Plate 305, where it appeared in a reproduction of page 1336 of an edition of Amyot's Plutarch published by François Le Preux,

at Lausanne, in 1574! (Morison also reproduces page 993 of the same volume as his Plate 304. Page 1336 is again reprinted in his *Art of the Printer*, Plate 136.)

The Harvard College Library lists a copy of this 1574 Le Preux edition as a part of its French Library, and it was thought at first that this might be the same as the Princeton copy; the collation of signatures is the same, the same headpiece and initial letters are used, and the watermark is the same as that found in the body of the Princeton copy (excepting the title page). But a photographic comparison and a collation of the two texts showed that they are different. There are differences of spellings, of readings, and of typography which are readily apparent. This Harvard copy is itself suspicious on various counts: its title page is apparently a fake, since it uses type faces unknown in the period and atypical spellings and accents; the *achevé d'imprimer* reads 1575 rather than 1574, and is on a paper different from that of the rest of the text; there is an unsigned leaf, between the end of the index and the colophon, which has been patched up and is partly in pen and ink. But pages 993 and 1336 of this copy are identical in all respects with the same pages from the 1574 edition as reproduced by Morison. Since Morison's pages are probably authentic, it would seem that this is a genuine copy of the Le Preux 1574 edition, but with a false title page and an *achevé d'imprimer* derived from a work dated 1575.

In fact, the other work dated 1575 is another edition of Amyot's Plutarch published by Le Preux in that year, a copy of which is found in the University of Pennsylvania Library. This edition has the identical colophon found in the Harvard 1574 copy, whose colophon presumably came from a 1575 copy of the same work. But the two Le Preux editions are not identical. Again, photographic comparison shows marked differences in spelling, ornamentation, and typography, although the type faces (both italic and round) are very close if not the same. The title of this 1575 edition is "LES / VIES DES HOMMES / ILLVSTRES GRECS ET / ROMAINS, COMPAREES L'VNE / AVEC L'AUTRE PAR PLVTARQVE / DE CHAERONEE, / TRANSLATEES DE GREC EN FRANCOIS PAR / Messire Iaques Amyot . . . A LAUSANNE. / PAR FRANCOIS LE PREUX. / Imprimeur de trespuissans Seigneurs de Berne. / M. D. LXXV." The colophon reads "Acheué d'Imprimer à Lausanne par François le Preux. / M. D. LXXV."

When this 1575 edition is compared with the Princeton copy, it becomes immediately evident that these are two copies of the same edition. Not only are the collations of signatures, the pagination, the ornamentation, and the type the same, but every irregularity of spacing found in the Princeton copy is reflected in the 1575 Le Preux. Photographic superimposition of the two imprints of folio A ij shows them to be identical in every respect. Some of the paper of the 1575 Le Preux, e. g. fols. VVVII and VVVIII, is the same as that used in the Princeton copy. The Princeton copy thus belongs to this 1575 edition, except for the substituted title page and the removal of the colophon.

To summarize: The original edition of Amyot's translation of Plutarch's *Vies des hommes illustres* is represented by the copy at the Library of Congress. Two editions by Le Preux, Lausanne 1574 and 1575, present two different publications of the same printer, but they use the same ornaments and even, in the cases of the two copies examined, the same paper. The copy at Harvard is the 1574 edition, with improper title page and colophon. The copy at Princeton belongs to the 1575 edition, in spite of its title page dated 1559, whose origin is unknown. The 1559 edition is listed by the Bibliothèque nationale (Paris) and the British Museum, the 1574 Le Preux by the British Museum, the 1575 Le Preux by Brunet, *Supplément*, II, col. 259.*

BERNARD WEINBERG

Washington University

SAINT EXUPÉRY IN NEW YORK

Antoine de Saint Exupéry, the great French aviator and writer who died on July 31st, 1944, lived in New York City for two years and four months. He arrived there on December 31st, 1940, and left early in April, 1943. He had paid brief visits to New York on two previous occasions: once in 1936, on an attempted flight from Montreal to Buenos Aires; and again in 1939, as co-pilot of

* I am indebted to Mrs. Gertrude Woodward and Mr. Ernst F. Detterer of the Newberry Library, Mr. Edwin E. Williams of the Harvard College Library, Mr. Elliott H. Morse of the University of Pennsylvania Library, and Mr. Frederick R. Goff of the Library of Congress for assistance in this study.

a big sea-plane with which the French hoped to establish a trans-atlantic air-mail service. It is his third and last sojourn in New York, however, which is the most significant. During this period he revealed his fine character and his delightful personality to those Americans who became his friends; and during this period he wrote three of the six works which he had published at the time of his death.

Saint Exupéry narrowly missed being shot down by the Nazis, it will be remembered, on a reconnaissance flight to Arras in May, 1940. After the Armistice, which occurred in June, he escaped to Portugal, and thence, six months later, to the United States. As we have noted above, he arrived in New York on December 31st. He was a passenger aboard the American Export Liner *Siboney*, which had been challenged twice during the crossing for identification by British warships. On leaving the vessel Saint Exupéry told reporters, with whom he spoke through an interpreter, that he planned to be in the United States for four weeks only, and would then return to France. One of his fellow-passengers on the trip was Jean Renoir, the French film producer who had written and directed *Grand Illusion* and produced *Carnival in Flanders*. *Tricolor*, in its issue of October, 1944, published an article by Stanley Walker describing as follows an incident in which Saint Exupéry was involved on the day of his arrival in New York:

He decided that he would like to eat bird's-nest soup. His friends . . . were piled into a taxicab outside his hotel, . . . and one of them who spoke English asked the driver to go to Chinatown. No one seemed to know any of the restaurants there, so Saint Ex, in his few words of English, tried to direct the driver. With the first words spoken, the cabman turned round, laughed, and said: "I know where you want to go. I took you there four years ago." It was the same driver who had recommended the restaurant to him the first time he had been in New York.

On January 14, 1941, Saint Exupéry attended a "book-and-author luncheon" at the Hotel Astor. Here he received a National Book Award, sponsored by the American Booksellers' Association and *The New York Herald-Tribune*. He had won this award, for the best non-fiction work produced in 1939, with *Wind, Sand, and Stars* a year previously, but had been prevented by the War from receiving his prize.

An interview with Saint Exupéry was published in *The New York Times* on January 19th, when he was living in a suite at the

Ritz-Carlton Hotel. He was described as having the affability and eagerness of a man who had come close to death and was glad to find himself alive. He seemed to take a perfectly natural pleasure in the fact that two hundred and fifty thousand copies of *Wind, Sand, and Stars* had already been sold. The interviewer was impressed especially with the size of the flier's feet, and was told that he liked his shoes to be large and comfortable. Saint Exupéry was wearing a "crew" haircut. One of his favorite pastimes was to make toy helicopters out of paper, and to launch them into the air, far above the sidewalks of New York. When questioned about his methods of work, he said that it was his habit to make several painstaking revisions of everything he wrote. He had brought to the United States a manuscript begun before the War, but had decided to abandon it in favor of a new book to be based on his last reconnaissance flight in May, 1940. This was the genesis of *Pilote de guerre*.

According to Professor Henri Peyre of Yale, who knew Saint Exupéry while the latter was living in New York, the famous flier disliked speaking in public, and did not accept invitations to appear before American college and university students, as other eminent Frenchmen have done. He did, however, speak a few times at the Lycée Français and at the Institut Français. He enjoyed strolling about the streets and dropping in at the Café de la Paix, whose cuisine he savored with the appreciation of a true *gourmet*. He would call his friends on the telephone and engage them in lengthy conversations. But all the while that he was tasting the pleasures of life in New York, he was writing steadily. He made thirteen or fourteen drafts of *Pilote de guerre* alone. Meanwhile he continued to re-read the masterpieces of French classical literature and to brood about the sorry state of affairs in France. Saint Exupéry never outgrew his habit of waking people in the middle of the night to ask their opinion of his most recent composition. Stanley Walker, in the article mentioned above, declares:

While writing *Flight to Arras* he would telephone his friends, and, regardless of the hour, read them his latest chapter, waiting expectantly at the end, like a child, for approbation and encouragement . . . One night he talked so long and so late that he actually fell asleep with the telephone in his hand. The person on the other end of the wire assumed that the conversation was over, and hung up. But during the day others called and got a "busy" signal. So they called his maid on the house-phone, and when

she said she could not rouse him, they became worried. Frantic, they summoned the police. Saint Ex was a bit surprised to be awakened by men in uniform, but took it as another example of the magic adventure of living.

Among the closest friends of Saint Exupéry, while he was living in New York, were: Denis de Rougemont, the philosopher; Pierre Lazareff, the journalist; and Monsieur Beaucaire, an engineer. Naturally these men became very familiar with his temperament, his habits, and his eccentricities. Though generally cheerful and considerate of others, he could at times be gloomy and even ill-tempered. He loved gadgets, and was especially fond of his dictaphone and his electric typewriter. He refused persistently to learn English, explaining that he had "not yet finished learning French." He often sang old French folk-songs with his friends. When the latter were ill, he would bring them toys which he had bought, or which he had made out of wood or paper. Saint Exupéry took very little interest in money. He was always generous with it, and he spent it freely to satisfy his desire for strange and unnecessary objects. In spite of his sturdy frame, he had a complete aversion to exercise and sport. He refused to put on an overcoat, even in the dead of winter. But he was fond of wearing a scarf, which he allowed to stream behind him in the wind, exactly like that of the Little Prince. Although he enjoyed playing games, he could not bear to lose. If he won, his delight was as great as if he had been a boy of ten. He was strongly attracted to pretty women, and they in turn were attracted to him.

Pilote de guerre, the author's fourth book, appeared in 1942. It was the first of his works whose original French edition was published in New York rather than in Paris. By this time New York had become, like Montreal, a center for the publication of new books by French writers, as well as for reprinting certain French classics. An English translation of *Pilote de guerre* also came out in 1942, under the title *Flight to Arras*, to be followed in 1943 by a Spanish translation, *Piloto de guerra*, published in Buenos Aires. During the German occupation of France this book was banned. Its importance was recognized in 1945 by the Aéro-Club of France, which awarded to the author, posthumously, its Grand Prix Littéraire. The Club decided that the prize money should be used in striking a medal to be presented to the aviation squadron of which he had been a member.

Like *Terre des hommes*, its predecessor, *Pilote de guerre* is an autobiographical narrative. It is much more closely knit than the earlier work, since it deals exclusively with Saint Exupéry's Arras flight of 1940. But it resembles *Terre des hommes* in its tendency towards philosophical digression, which now concerns itself to a large extent with war and other problems of the present day. This volume affords the American reader an excellent opportunity to see the fall of France through the eyes of a highly intelligent and highly trained observer.

In the years 1941, 1942, and 1943, while Saint Exupéry was living in New York, he was greatly distressed by the bitter conflict between those Frenchmen who were loyal to Marshal Pétain's Vichy Government and the "Fighting French" who supported General de Gaulle. On November 29, 1942, he published in *The New York Times* "An Open Letter to Frenchmen Everywhere," in which he urged his fellow-countrymen to put aside their personal quarrels and to unite in a concerted effort to defeat the enemy. He knew that men engaged in bickering among themselves can never hope to repel a powerful invader. And he knew that men who are fighting side by side have little time for mutual recrimination. Accordingly he wrote:

During the War in 1940, when I came back from a mission with my plane shot full of holes, I used to drink an excellent Pernod at the squadron bar. I often won my Pernod throwing dice, sometimes from a Royalist comrade, perhaps from one who was a Socialist, or perhaps from Lieutenant Israel, the bravest of our crew, who was a Jew. And we all clinked glasses in the greatest friendliness . . . Frenchmen, let us become reconciled . . . Let us not dispute now about precedence, about honors, about justice, or about priorities. There is nothing of all this offered to us. They are only offering us rifles—and there will be plenty of those for everybody. . . . When we find ourselves one day in a bomber together, fighting five or six Messerschmitts, the thought of our quarrels will make us smile.

In the same article Saint Exupéry declares: "I have only one thought—namely, to rejoin in Tunis my comrades of Group 2/33." Nevertheless he could not rejoin his comrades immediately. While he was waiting for a favorable opportunity to do so he wrote a book which was ostensibly intended for children, but which was received with enthusiasm by thousands of grown-ups having a taste for fantasy. The book was provided with colored illustrations by the author, and the name of it was *le Petit Prince*. Two versions, one

in French and the other in English, were published in New York in 1943. André Maurois, who visited Saint Exupéry and his wife while *le Petit Prince* was being written, described his experiences thus in *La Victoire* on October 6, 1945:

I remember a week-end that I spent with them in a large American country-house, among the trees of the forest, the beasts of the field, and the shining stars. It was like a dream. Saint Ex, who was then working on *le Petit Prince*, wrote all night long, calling us from time to time to show us his drawings: that planet so tiny that a single tree could disturb its equilibrium; and that mysterious boy-prince who was himself and who yet was not himself. When he left us Consuelo asked me: "Have I ever told you *my* story? Have I told you about Oppède?" "No. What is Oppède?" "Oppède is a city, a dead city among the rocks, above Avignon, which my comrades and I brought back to life. Oppède is a kingdom of stone; it is the castle of Raymond de Toulouse; it is a church which the peasants call Our Lady of Thieves; it contains the studios where our architects drew and our sculptors carved." But Saint Exupéry's door had opened, and he had come back to us with a fresh drawing in his hand . . . And so I spent a magic night, in the company of those two enchanters.

Le Petit Prince is dedicated to Léon Werth, the novelist and critic who is perhaps best known for his works on art. In the dedication Saint Exupéry refers to him as "the best friend I have in the world," as "one who can understand everything," and as "one who lives in France, where he is hungry and cold." Léon Werth is also the man to whom *Lettre à un otage* is written. This little book, the last one that the author wrote, appeared in New York in 1943. Up to the present time no English translation of it has been published.

Early in April, 1943, Saint Exupéry left New York and went to North Africa. There and in Italy, in spite of his age and his physical disabilities, he made flight after flight as a member of a photographic reconnaissance wing engaged in mapping targets for British and American bombers. From one of these flights, on July 31st, 1944, he never returned. Three months later, near Toulon, they found the wreckage of his plane. Like the Little Prince, he had gone forth alone to keep his inevitable rendez-vous with death.

ELIOT G. FAY

Emory University

THOMAS DAY ON AMERICAN POETRY: 1786

In 1786 Joel Barlow sent Dr. Richard Price a manuscript copy of *The Vision of Columbus* and requested the English liberal's candid opinion on the advisability of publishing the poem in London. Price replied on February 4, 1787, that such a venture would not at the time be wise, because of Barlow's fervid "Dedication to the King of France, the encomiums on France and the American army, and the censures of this country"; but he softened the blow with kindly encouragement: publication "either in America or at Paris" would not only do *you* but *your country* credit."¹

There were apparently other reasons, however, why the benevolent Dr. Price did not wish to associate himself with an English edition of the young American's poem. Through the agency of publisher John Stockdale, Price had sent a copy of the manuscript, at Barlow's suggestion,² to Thomas Day, a man of letters well versed in the ways of publishers and one who might be supposed to exert some influence among them because of the popularity of his *Sanford and Merton*. Even before he received the manuscript, Day dashed off from his home at Anningsley, near Chertsey, a completely discouraging review of reasons why English publication of the poem should not be undertaken, least of all under the sponsorship of Dr. Price.³ At the same time, he took the opportunity sturdily to flay other American poets who had come to his attention. Of young Barlow, he said, "I know nothing." Nor did he expect much:

Poetical excellence, like every other excellence, is not very common; and in every age which abounds with so many versifiers, a mediocrity of this,

¹ Theodore A. Zunder, *The Early Days of Joel Barlow* (New Haven, 1934), pp. 228-229.

² Barlow seems to have sent several copies for just this purpose. Price wrote on March 24, 1788, that he had "taken care to convey to Mr. [William] Hayley and to Mr. Day the copies you directed to them"; see Zunder, *op. cit.*, p. 229.

³ Thomas Day to Richard Price, April 8, 1786. Although printed from transcripts provided by Mr. Walter Ashburner of London in "The Price Papers," *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, new ser., xvii, 339-341 (1903), this letter has apparently escaped notice of students of eighteenth-century American poetry and of Anglo-American literary relations.

like every other talent, will excite very little curiosity. As to the composition of an epic poem, it must certainly possess either a very extraordinary degree of merit, or it must be tiresome and insipid to the last degree; witness the very small number of attempts in this nature which have succeeded in so many ages and countries. I cannot say that such a genius may not arise in America; but till I see proofs of it, I have very little faith in the prodigy.

Epic-aspiring flights from across the Atlantic did not excite Thomas Day: "All the attempts I have hitherto seen in that way from that country are certainly not above mediocrity." He found the "poem of Colonel Humphreys . . . but indifferent."⁴ On the pretensions of Timothy Dwight, however, he was more voluble:

Stockdale for my entertainment has sent me down another extraordinary performance called the Conquest of Canaan [Hartford, 1785], which is also intended for an epic poem. The writer of this long, tiresome work is certainly not destitute of poetical genius, had he cultivated it more, and published less. The lines are in general easy and flowing, and the descriptions neither destitute of fancy nor strength; but the whole plan is so extremely injudicious and tiresome that the writer might as well have called it an elegy, a tragedy, or eclogue, or anything else in rhyme, as an epic poem, and I defy the most resolute reader to wade through it without yawning an hundred times.

Day was not enthusiastic about the possibility of Barlow's work being any better. "If, as I suspect," he continued, "the Columbiad⁵ should prove of the same nature, I fear the poor auth[or] will be much disappointed in the sanguine ideas he entertains of improving his fortune by it." Barlow seemed altogether too ambitious to the older man:

From the inclosed letter which you sent, he seems to be one of the "genius irritabile vatum," and I cannot help lamenting that he has honoured you with a post which I fear will prove so troublesome. You are to consider that the character of this kind bears a much closer analogy to that of Catiline, than your friend Dr. [John] Shebbeare could ever make out for you; "ardens in cupiditatibus; satis eloquentiae, sapientiae parum": and his expectations from his own productions are generally "immoderata,

⁴ Probably *The Glory of America; or, Peace Triumphant over War* (Philadelphia, 1783), although Hunphreys had also published *A Poem Addressed to the Armies of the United States* (New Haven, 1780) and *A Poem on the Happiness of America* (London and Hartford, 1780).

⁵ This, so far as I can determine, is the first time the poem was alluded to by the title which Barlow gave it twenty years later, after he had rewritten and expanded it for second publication in 1807.

in credibilia, nimis alta." The office you have undertaken must at all events prove troublesome, and the discharge of it, with whatever fidelity, can hardly be expected to please. He commissions you to dispose of the copyright; but, when it is remembered that Milton sold his immortal work for ten pound, what offer of a London bookseller for this production of Western genius is likely to satisfy the author? From the disposition he seems to make of the prod[uce] he seems to me to entertain ideas which are never likely to be realizd.

In short, Day strongly advised Price to take no responsibility in finding a publisher for *The Vision*. "[Would] it not therefore be better," he suggested, "before you took any decisive measures, to acquaint the author with the offers that have been made, and let him decide for himself about the disposal of his own invaluable property?" Finally, he counselled: "Should your good-nature think of printing it yourself, though I would not wish to stint your bounty, you will pardon me, who from being a brother author, am alive to all the misfortunes of the trade, if I suggest the possibility of your being considerably out of pocket?" It does not seem beyond reason to suppose that Thomas Day's warnings influenced the reply which Richard Price sent to Joel Barlow.

LEWIS LEARY

Duke University

AN ADEQUATE TEXT OF J. M. SYNGE

Of the four separate editions of the collected works of J. M. Synge, none is complete. The first, Dublin edition of 1910 omits the essay "An Autumn Night in the Hills," which originally appeared in *The Gael* (New York, April, 1903) and was reprinted in *The Pilot* (Boston). The Boston edition of 1911 is identical with the Dublin edition, also omitting "An Autumn Night in the Hills." The London edition, Allen and Unwin, 1929-1934, also omits "An Autumn Night in the Hills," as well as the essay "Under Ether." This edition, however, prints for the first time a letter of Synge's to an unidentified young man and some valuable passages from Synge's notebooks. The Random House edition of 1935, *The Complete Works of John M. Synge*, omits six essays¹

¹ "The Oppression of the Hills," "On the Road," "The People of the Glens," "At a Wicklow Fair," "A Landlord's Garden in County Wicklow," "Glencree."

and five poems² but strangely enough contains the hitherto unreprinted "An Autumn Night in the Hills." Both the London and the New York publishers claim to have assembled their editions from texts submitted to them by the Synge estate, but apparently no check was made to determine their accuracy or completeness.

In 1908 Synge wrote to Max Meyerfeld that he had rewritten and improved a portion of the third act of *The Well Of The Saints*.³ There were, therefore, two versions of the third act of the play: the first published in 1905,⁴ and the second referred to by Synge as having been written in 1908. Although this improved version of the third act had been given to the Abbey Theatre for its acting version,⁵ it was not substituted for the discarded, older version until the London edition of 1932 printed it. To complicate matters further, the Random House edition for some curious reason reverted to the earlier text.

In order to have a complete, authentic text of Synge's works one therefore must use the London edition, because it alone has the approved reading of *The Well Of The Saints* and some hitherto unpublished material from the notebooks of Synge. But since this London edition omits two essays, "Under Ether" and "An Autumn Night in the Hills," one must also have the Random House edition, which is the only one containing the latter essay.

DAVID H. GREENE

Washington Square College,
New York University

A WORDSWORTH-POPE PARALLEL

None of Wordsworth's best-known editors has drawn attention to the possibility that the opening line of his famous address to the Poet, "If thou indeed derive thy light from Heaven," echoes

² The translations from Villon, Colin Musset, Walter von der Vogelweide, and Leopardi.

³ "Letters of John Millington Synge," *Yale Review* (xiii, 1924), 708-9.

⁴ London, A. H. Bullen.

⁵ Synge wrote to Meyerfeld that he had rewritten the act for the Abbey's production of the play in May, 1908. It was from the Abbey company's acting version that the revised version was finally obtained.

a passage in Pope's *An Essay on Criticism*.¹ Comparing the critic to the poet in the origin of his distinguishing merit, Pope writes:

In Poets as true genius is but rare,
True Taste as seldom is the Critic's share;
Both must alike from Heav'n derive their light. (11-13)

Wordsworth, though never a champion of Pope's verse, had a higher regard for *An Essay on Criticism* than for Pope's later poems. Writing to Alexander Dyce on May 10, 1830, he said:

Pope, in that production of his *Boyhood*, the ode to Solitude, and in his *Essay on Criticism*, has furnished proofs that at one period of his life he felt the charm of a sober and subdued style, which he afterwards abandoned for one that is to my taste at least too pointed and ambitious, and for a versification too timidly balanced.

At some time in his life, too, Wordsworth got many of Pope's verses by heart, for about 1836 he remarked: "To this day I believe I could repeat, with a little previous rummaging of my memory, several thousand lines of Pope."² It is not improbable, therefore, that he could recall the line in question.

CHESTER L. SHAVER

Oberlin College

THE "DUKE'S" TOOTH-POWDER RACKET: A NOTE ON *HUCKLEBERRY FINN*

Just after the "King" and the "Duke" come aboard the raft in *Huckleberry Finn*, the "Duke" reveals that he has gotten himself into trouble by "selling an article to take the tartar off the teeth—and it does take it off, too, and generly the enamel along with it—" Evidence of the actual existence and extent of this racket is offered in the following indignant editorial from *The New York Weekly* of August 24, 1871, page 6:

¹ No allusion to the possibility is made by Knight, Dowden, Hutchinson, George, Harper, or De Selincourt.

² See R. D. Havens, *The Mind of a Poet* (Baltimore, 1941), p. 402.

TOOTH-DESTROYERS

The greatest foes to teeth are the unprincipled scamps who peddle dentrifices through the streets, exhibiting the efficacy of their villainous compounds by selecting innocent urchins as their victims. A boy is selected from a crowd gathered by the peddler's eloquence, and in an instant his teeth are cleansed. The staring spectators having thus seen a practical test of its virtue, purchase the tooth-powder, and use it on their own masticators until the acid and potash, of which it is composed, eats away the protecting enamel of the teeth rendering speedy decay certain. In Boston, we think, a tooth-powder peddler obtained his deserts by being sentenced to a year's imprisonment. Were his fellow-swindlers treated similarly wherever found endeavoring to effect a sale of their injurious compounds, the dentists would lose their best friends, the tooth-destroyers.

JOSEPH JONES

The University of Texas

REVIEWS

The Centennial Edition of Sidney Lanier. ed. by CHARLES R. ANDERSON, General editor, and PAULL F. BAUM, KEMP MALONE, CLARENCE GOHDES, GARLAND GREEVER, CECIL ABERNETHY, PHILIP GRAHAM, and AUBREY H. STARKE.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1945. Ten volumes. \$30.00.

Sidney Lanier has become the first major American writer to attain the finality of a definitive edition, complete in text, scholarly in apparatus, and magnificent in format. This fact is not untouched with irony if one recalls a certain condescension in the golden day of New England toward the creation of literature in other regions of America. Yet Emerson or Hawthorne still wait for this particular kind of immortality, while the frail singer of Georgia takes on in these ten royal volumes the quality of an established classic, as indeed, in some ways, he is. Here is Lanier's "shining presence," as Lowell called it, fully revealed in his poetry, criticism, fiction, and in several other mediums explored by his eager, restless genius.

The scope of this Centennial Edition, originally planned to celebrate the anniversary of Lanier's birth in 1842, but delayed by the war, is extensive. If my simple arithmetic holds, it numbers more than four thousand, five hundred pages. Apart from its texts and

*For details, see *MLN.*, June 1946, p. xxiii.

multiple technical auxiliaries (prefaces, tables of contents, variants, notes, chronologies, calendars, bibliographies, indices, and illustrations), some three hundred pages are devoted to critical estimates; there are, for instance, eight separate introductions, most of them of formidable length. Although taken together these form the equivalent of a detailed biography, we are promised a more specific volume on Lanier's early years. When we remember the full-length portrait in Aubrey Starke's recent biography and recall the other lesser biographies and studies, the British charge that Americans neglect their own poets appears less tenable. In the case of Lanier, the danger would seem otherwise, namely that this brilliant, fitful poet, with his slender garland of verse, might sink to earth under the weight of his devoted critics. No one can ever again read "The Song of the Chatahoochee" or "The Symphony" with a pleasant sense of discovery or possession. You can't discover or possess a national park; and the detail of this vast edition makes Lanier just about that in our literature. Though the editors describe other manuscripts still unpublished, we may now be content. Rather more than the essential writing of Sidney Lanier stands on our shelves in these encyclopedic volumes.

Naturally these came into being only through a cooperative enterprise, of eight editors (and other assistants) under the leadership of Charles R. Anderson; through their scholarship exercised upon a gigantic assembly of Lanieriana, among these some fifteen hundred letters, manuscripts of prose and poetry, fragments, notebooks, first editions, reviews, musical compositions, juvenilia. The story of the development of the text as related in the General Preface is a stimulating record of principles formed and difficulties overcome. Out of the chaos of materials, out of the labour and thought, has been created a self-sufficient and authoritative volume of the poems; four volumes of letters; and five other volumes concerned with, respectively, Lanier's musical interests (among these *The Science of English Verse*), his studies on Shakespeare, his essays on the English novel and other topics, his novel *Tiger-Lilies*, and miscellaneous prose, such as *Florida*. Twenty years ago many scholars, looking speculatively at Lanier as a challenge to clarification felt a certain parallel between the miscellaneous, distraught character of Lanier's life and these disparate and confused sources; to bring simple order out of this disarray is an achievement.

Turning to more specific qualities in the scholarship of these volumes, one is struck by the multitudinous detail in variant, footnote, and bibliography. It might be argued that such elaborateness inclines to make piety painful; the passion, whether sectional, personal, or scholarly (it is probably all three) for each cedilla of information concerning Lanier may seem to some readers out of key with Lanier's modest rank in the world of literature. To this view I cannot hold, for two reasons: one is based on the common-

place saw concerning things worth doing at all; the other is the exceptional skill of the editors in relegating their scaffolding and their filagree to their proper backgrounds. When the footnotes occur, which is not in every volume, they seldom distract us from the page. The exegetical material is immense, yet usually unobtrusive. In Volume I, for example, we may read not only the familiar poems, and those now added to the canon, as *poetry*; we encounter a clear text, a beautiful page, and no footprints of the editors save the dates of composition and publication. At the back of this volume, however, each poem is honoured with a succinct note commenting on composition, publication, text, and the place of the poem in Lanier's life and art. Thus awkward collision of the professional student and the reader of Lanier for his own sake is avoided. With the same judgment the editors have contrived to make the introductions, numerous and weighty as they are, background; from the beginning to the end of this long story we are asked to consider simply "what Lanier wrote and what he intended it to signify."

If we do consider this, we shall probably linger too long over the first volume, which establishes the Lanier canon of poetry as one hundred and sixty-four poems. Of these a hundred were printed in the volumes edited by Lanier's wife; twenty were uncollected; and forty-four were unpublished. We are asked to read the poetry in four groups, each arranged chronologically to indicate Lanier's development. The first group consists, for the most part, of poems which Lanier himself elected for publication; the other groups offer, respectively, poems he did not intend to publish, some verses written in collaboration with his brother Clifford Lanier, and juvenilia. No single new poem, so far as I may judge, appears to rival the dozen or so lyrics which posterity has accepted as the characteristic expression of Lanier's genius. Completeness, but not, I think, new values are achieved by this final canon.

It is, however, agreeable to re-read the old favourites, with the guidance of Mr. Anderson's introduction, shrinking a little before the familiar diffuseness, extravagance, and sentimentality, but yielding to the spell of Lanier's sensitivity to nature, to music, to the anxieties of humanity. The full expression of this sensitivity came late. To the war Lanier's poetry owed far less than to the Reconstruction, which at last drew him away from his early imitations of Tennyson and Poe into a consideration of the functions of poetry; in his mature verse he recorded not merely his personal perplexities and the economic distresses of the South, but also the wider nineteenth century dilemmas of science, religion, and the destiny of man. To these problems Lanier never found more than sentimental solutions; but the record of his intense identification with them is still moving; perhaps, after all, his answer of "Love" is as clear as all the tangled reasoning of the teleologists of his day.

In brief, in Volume I, we reexperience our old delight in the throb and passion of his poetry.

In some measure, this was the ecstasy of the musician, and for this reason the second volume is one of the most interesting in the series; it renders available not only *The Science of English Verse*, but also ten essays on music, among them "The Physics of Music," the significant precursor of the longer study. In a later volume (III) Mr. Malone suggests that Lanier's powers as a scholar were limited chiefly to metrics; therefore, to place before us, in Volume II, the whole case for Lanier as a musician is important. In his sane Introduction Mr. Baum tempers current exaggerations concerning the poet's musical talent. Lanier's own tempestuous homage to music and the lyrical tributes to him as a flautist have encouraged the tradition that he was an exceptional musician. "Whatever turn I have for art, is purely musical . . ."; "Music lifts me to a heaven of pain"; these and similar outcries we all recall. Mr. Baum, however, offers a detailed history of Lanier's musical development and sets *The Science of English Verse* against the background of the complicated history of prosody. He respects Lanier's talent, in both theory and practice, but he reminds us that this is, after all, "a book by a beginner." He concedes that Lanier was adept with his flute, but he adds:

He was never in the strict sense a trained musician; his appreciation was rather sentimental than critical; his opportunities for hearing his favorite music, that of the orchestra, were until the last few years unfortunately limited; and his technical knowledge both of the theory and of the history of music was very fragmentary. Yet he made the most of what he had and what he knew; so that any one reading these essays carelessly might never suspect his weakness for rash statement and insufficiently supported claim. In music as on other subjects his "over-luxuriant imagination" was without "regulative control."

This lack of "regulative control" distresses the reader of both the next two volumes (III. *Shakespeare and His Forerunners*; IV. *The English Novel, and Essays on Literature*). Yet Lanier's intermittent emotional and rhetorical excesses cannot hide his wide-ranging cultural interests. "The Peabody Lectures" and "The Johns Hopkins Lectures" include studies so varied in character as those on Chaucer, Wyatt, George Eliot and Bartholomew Griffin. His learning was scattered and undisciplined, but in its way, and for its time in the history of scholarship, impressive. Among his papers were versifications of passages from the *Beowulf* and the *Phoenix*, as well as unrevised translations of *Judith*, *Genesis B*, *Dream of the Rood* (1-89), and *Wanderer*. After an analysis of his limitations in Anglistic scholarship, Mr. Malone goes so far as to say:

Given the health and strength to go on, he would surely have mastered the philological discipline and might well have become one of the leading

Anglicists of his day. And though he had hardly begun his scholarly career when death brought it to an end, he left behind him a substantial body of learned writings.

Thus our confused impressions about Lanier as a musician and Lanier as a scholar subside in the clear definitions of Mr. Baum and Mr. Malone.

It must be confessed, however, that the reading of these lectures and, in particular, of those on the Novel are, as in the past, an unhappy experience. These are "extension" lectures at their worst: verbose, sentimental, too large in sweep, too piously didactic, and covered over with a fine rash of prudery. The illustrative quotations from the authors are themselves a blessed relief from these harangues; one title is suggestive; "From Aeschylus to George Eliot, the Development of Personality." Perhaps the most arresting passages in these particular volumes are those conveying Lanier's rather rare evaluations of his American contemporaries in poetry. One of these is on Emerson, who gave him "immeasurable delight," but we are especially interested in the culmination in Volume IV of his judgments (restored to their original vigour) on the poetry of Walt Whitman. One wonders what he would have thought of the poetry of Emily Dickinson, who in far-away Amherst was, with motivations not wholly unlike his own, experimenting with verse and with an intellectual iconoclasm.

In these volumes and in Volume V (*Tiger-Lilies and Southern Prose*) one seems to detect a valiant effort on the part of the editors to sustain the weaker qualities in Lanier's writing. There is even a hint of the absurd in turning from the frontispiece showing Lanier beside Jefferson and Lee, in the three niches in the Duke University Chapel, to this weak novel and to this trivial prose. Mr. Greever's Introduction, which is too long and too eager to list formally important qualities in a flimsy novel, is forced to conclude: "Finally, it radiates good will." So do the Rollo books! Yet Mr. Greever, like the other editors, is temperate in his claims for Lanier: he admits the weakness of both plot and characterization and wisely suggests the importance of the autobiographical elements, among them Lanier's debt to German literature.

Little more can be said for *Tiger-Lilies* either as a novel or as a transcript of man's experience in war. Placed side by side with John William DeForest's brilliant, realistic *Miss Ravenel's Conversion*, published, by an odd chance, in the very year of *Tiger-Lilies*, the ineffectuality of Lanier as a novelist is underlined. The same faults which are tolerable in Lanier's lyrics, such as sentimentality and rhetoric, made him a dangerous man composing a novel. Freed from the restraints of stanza and rhyme he could write of

A dun-blue cloud, that seemed like a huge bruise on the pearly cheek of the sky, hung over the distant end of the line of peaks. From behind it,

the sun shot crimson streaks like veins up the sky; but presently came down out of the cloud, making its edge an insupportable crimson brilliancy, and like a red, flaming heart, throbbed out infinite, pulsing floods of glittering blood-light over world and heaven.

I do not think this passage, honestly chosen at random, is unfair to Lanier; the importance of *Tiger-Lilies* must remain historical and sociological. It is a violent expression of the romantic nineteenth century novel. It is also a psychological curiosity.

The descent in quality is not stayed by Volume VI (*Florida and Miscellaneous Prose*). What its introduction says of "Sketches of India" is true of the entire volume: "One looks in vain here for the true Lanier." Here, in fact, is the hack-writer, the harassed man of middle age, almost frantic from lung hemorrhages and poverty, reading feverishly to fling together a guide-book on Florida. With relief we turn to the four volumes of letters which help to restore the "real Lanier." Perhaps this balance was calculated by the shrewd editors (their assignment of the Bibliography to Volume VI rather than to the same volume as that of the Index is another instance of their careful planning). At any rate, the Letters bring us back sharply to the poetic mind which, we encountered in Volume I. For this reason I venture to compare the last four volumes in quality with the first.

I do not, however, mean that Lanier is one of the great letter-writers in our literature; here, again, he exhibits too much of his "Zauberflöte," his whimsical sweetness, his rhetoric. Nothing could, for example, be more irritating than his windy account, in Elizabethan archaisms, of the Southern scene, as recounted in his letter to Mary Day, on November 22, 1872. Yet the man himself is in these letters, as he is not in *Florida* and in other miscellanea salvaged by the editors. If we adhere to the object of the edition, to know what Lanier wrote and what he intended it to signify, then we must read at some length in these excited, gossipy, and self-revelatory letters. Totalling nearly seventeen hundred pages of text, they are, perhaps, in their completeness (from January 6, 1857, when Lanier was fifteen years old, to July 26, 1881, the eve of his death) the crown of the Centennial Edition. The publication of these four volumes alone would have been a significant literary event.

Of the consequences upon our intellectual life of the publication of the Centennial Edition of Sidney Lanier, two are paramount. First, the editors have clarified rather than added new stature to the genius of this writer. When all is said and done, Lanier still remains the author of *The Symphony*, and a few other poems *sub specie aeternitatis*. Only these, and possibly *The Science of English Verse* and the letters, are important to comprehend his peculiar greatness as a poet. So spattered was his work, so far is the distinguished *Marshes of Glynn* from the worthless *Florida* that no

illumination comes, as for example in the case of Melville, from a study of the minor writings. I have already mentioned Emily Dickinson in connection with Lanier; they will appear together as experimenters in the forthcoming cooperative *Literary History of the United States*. This poetess may be used as an illustration of the assertion that no cubit has been added, even by the mammoth ten volumes, to Lanier's height, for the issue, by contrast, of the single volume, *Bolts of Melody*, has shown Miss Dickinson to be far greater even than her previous volumes proclaimed. This is not a comparison of the two very different artists but merely an illustration of a fact concerning Lanier. Beautiful and memorable poet he is indeed, but this we have long known.

The second consequence of these volumes, apart from the elucidation and definition of this particular genius of Lanier's, is the high and vital standards which they invoke for our scholarship. As, in the future, other scholars attempt editions of major writers, it is to the Centennial Edition that they will turn for practical advice. In the history of our scholarship in American literature, the Centennial Edition is a landmark.

STANLEY T. WILLIAMS

Yale University

The Stylistic Development of Keats. By WALTER JACKSON BATE. New York: The Modern Language Association of America. 1945. Pp. x + 214. \$3.00. (Revolving Fund Series, No. xiii.)

John Keats' Fancy: The Effect on Keats of the Psychology of His Day. By JAMES RALSTON CALDWELL. Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press. 1945. Pp. x + 206. \$2.00.

In substance and in method Bate's study is admirable. Its argument is built upon detailed statistical data, painstakingly ascertained; but unlike many monographs of this type, it is not witless, dull, or out of tune with the spirit of poetry. Some of Bate's conclusions are not new, but he places generalizations which were impressionistic upon massive new foundations. He utilizes all the previous commentaries pertinent to his subject, but does not indolently depend upon them. What he says of Garrod's remarks on the relationship between Keats's sonnets and odes is characteristic, viz., "Something may be added to what Garrod says, and the connection of the ode-stanza with the sonnet may be more firmly established" (p. 127). Bate's contribution is threefold: (1) a systematic account of Keats's growth as a literary artist; (2) comparisons between his

styles and those of Shakespeare, Spenser, Milton, Dryden, Pope, eighteenth-century versifiers, Hunt, etc.; and (3) observations upon the influences which those authors may have had upon Keats. I confine my comments to the first, as of relatively greatest importance.

Bate starts from the point (considered in his *Negative Capability*, 1939) that to Keats the aim of poetry always was the discovery of the real, and its complete and intense expression, which required the mastery of the most appropriate expressional means. Thus the history of his stylistic development became a series of increasingly skilful methods of utterance, metrical, phonetic, etc. His constant effort was to find a prosody really congenial to Poesy:

So if we will not let the Muse be free,
She will be bound with garlands of her own.

It was a valiant struggle against errors of taste and judgment, some traditional, some subjective; and it reached as nearly complete a victory as human fallibility allows.

The chief stages in the progress, as Bate maps it, were the following (many of the phrases being Bate's, but any errors mine). In *Endymion* Keats sought unprecedented freedom in prosody, and fell into excessive luxury and laxness. In *Isabella* his diction and rhythm grew less soft and liquescent, and its stanzas were not so loosely knit as the earlier couplets. Thereafter Intensity, harmonized with its apparent opposite, Restraint, became the goal. The most profound and precise Truth about every actuality, including its relationships to its origins, became, when passionately expressed, Beauty, i. e., the Poetry in which Truth and Beauty co-exist. In *Hyperion* Keats further developed his tendency toward restraint of expression and integrity of the blank-verse line; and in *The Eve of St. Agnes* he succeeded in combining impassioned richness of diction, sounds, and metaphors, with firm patterns of stanzaic form. In his later sonnets he sought a movement with a slow and satisfying rise, and a close which "sets soberly although in magnificence." (See the superb yet accurate self-criticism in his letter of Feb. 27, 1818, comparing the movement of a beautiful sonnet to the rise and setting of the sun.) In the *Odes* his stylistic achievement reached its height,—dynamic diction, effulgence of imagery and sound, held within "forms of strict sobriety and classical restraint." It was the union of power and grace,—

Might half-slumbering on its own right arm.

Lamia, in form more nearly Augustan than any other couplet-poem of the century, seemed to mark a departure toward an uncertain and never-reached goal; but in *To Autumn*, his last great poem, Keats returned to the style of his earlier odes. To some readers, craving a neater scheme, this ending may seem abrupt or obscure; but it is the only one possible to Bate's close and candid scrutiny of the true facts. The demonstration that Keats persistently tried

to fashion "forms of strict sobriety and classical restraint," will probably surprise and perhaps disconcert the hand-and-fast period-fabricators who assume that the differences between the romantic and the classical schools are absolute.

Bate pays some attention to the causal relationships between content and form, but his work would have been more nearly perfect if he had considered that relationship thoroughly (a footnote on p. 143 hints that he may do so in a sequel). The only grave fault in his excellent book is carelessness in proof-reading; I have noted about twenty errors,* most of them in quotations from Keats.

A recurrent defect in Caldwell's volume, even in its title, is the lack of preciseness. It covers less ground than the place of Fancy in Keats's entire poetic development; yet it embraces more than the influences upon him of contemporaneous psychological theories. Its merit lies not in its main thesis, which is vague and partly erroneous, but in some of its passages. Caldwell's appreciative sensibility is often admirable. He furnishes some valuable information and comments on Keats's "life of sensation," and on the theories of association and imagination developed by Hartley, Alison, Wordsworth, and Hazlitt.

His chief purpose is to stress the importance in Keats's theory and practice, of subconscious cerebration, dreaming and day-dreaming, hitting upon a subject and then letting the mind take a vagrant way,—a kind of imagining sanctioned by contemporaneous psychologies. It is true that Keats's method, or lack of method, in some of the earlier poems becomes more intelligible in the light of this explanation; and as a commentary on those poems Caldwell's book is praiseworthy. But already in his interpretation of *Endymion*, one begins to have doubts; and when he tries to apply his theory to the later poems, it seems to me to break down. Caldwell's own analyses of the *Odes* show that they were not created by "the wild, spontaneous ranging of thought," or composed "without constraint" (whatever that may mean) by "the contemplation of opposites"; and he does not even attempt to test his thesis by applying it to *Lamia*, *Isabella*, or either *Hyperion*. He summons Hazlitt in defense; but Hazlitt's modification of Hartley's psychology, his advocacy of the discernment of opposites in the flux, is obviously not a plea for letting thought run unchanneled. Nor was the acceptance of Hazlitt's principle of counterpoint the only way in which the maturer Keats purposefully strove towards formal harmony or equilibrium (see Bate for the many other ways).

Caldwell justly attacks Finney's *Evolution of Keats's Poetry* for

* Pp. 19, 100, 119, 126, 136, 156, 160, 164, 165, 167, 170, 175, 177, 180, 191, 194, 199, 202.

misrepresenting Keats by making him too intellectual and schematic. He is sharply critical of scholarship in general, charging that it likes to discover systems of thought where none was intended. The weakness may be admitted; but when a book like this appears, it is proper to remark that scholarship has other and better traits,—namely, a dislike of false simplification, and an ability to recognize and expound complex aesthetic and intellectual phenomena which are too intricate for dull and lazy dilettantism to understand and set forth. In Keats's greater poems, the creative forces are not of one kind but of many; and the soundest interpretations will not be simple but complex. In them there was a confluence from the one hand, of the subconscious, the unpremeditated, the inspired; and from the other, of the conscious intent, the deliberate judgment, the memory of literary, artistic, and intellectual experiences, and also recent personal and emotional events with resultant moods of exaltation or depression. The higher Keats rose in his creative achievements, the weaker grew the undirected subconscious impulses. Mere drifting ceased; self-chosen directions, and self-determined bounds, intensified his current's force.

ERNEST BERNBAUM

University of Illinois

Elizabethan Studies and Other Essays in Honor of George F. Reynolds. University of Colorado Studies. Series B. Vol. II, No. 4. Boulder, Col.: U. of Col. Press, 1945. Pp. x + 387. 1 plate. \$2.50.

This volume, honoring Professor Reynolds upon the occasion of his retirement from the headship of the English Department of the University of Colorado, reflects credit upon him and the institution which he has served. The book is an ambitious performance, containing forty-four articles by contributors from twenty-nine colleges and universities. Fourteen of these articles are Elizabethan studies, seven are discussions on matters of educational theory, and the remainder range through all periods of English and American literature except Old English, the Augustan Age, and the Victorian Age, which are not represented. Ten of the articles are by members of the staff of the University of Colorado, who thus indicate Professor Reynolds' skill as a department builder, for their contributions stand up well in the presence of severe competition and in several instances contain materials of permanent value to scholarship. The bibliography of Professor Reynolds' writings shows the wide range of his interests, which have largely determined the plan of the book.

Neither the talents of the present reviewer nor the space allotted to him can suffice to discuss adequately all of the articles here presented. It is possible only to give brief mention to some of them. They range from a revaluation of John Gower (George R. Coffman) to a discussion of Kenneth Fearing (Charles D. Abbott). Four new discoveries are of interest: the first printing of an unfinished story by Fitz-James O'Brien (Francis Wolle), the resurrection of an early poem by Poe (Jay B. Hubbell), the detection in Shelley's *Proposal for Reform* of another forgery by Thomas J. Wise (Robert Metcalf Smith), and the discussion of two rare broadsides attacking Thomas Hobbes after his death (Betty T. Stocks). There are three useful bibliographical studies of Edward Young (Henry Pettit), the mystery of Elizabeth Canning (Lillian Bueno McCue), and American first performances of English plays (Martin Staples Shockley). The modern theater is discussed in three articles (E. J. West, Barnard Hewitt, Carl Glick), and the American historical novel in one (Ernest E. Leisy). Eighteenth century literary relationships appear in "Smollett and Garrick" (Lewis M. Knapp) and "Edmund Burke and James Barry" (Donald C. Bryant). Another article presents valuable materials on the literary reputation of Keats (Hyder E. Rollins).

Several works of literary criticism require brief comment. "Chaucer's Cressida" (Sherman B. Neff) is an eloquent *apologia* for that misguided heroine. "Epic Conventions in *Paradise Lost*" (J. Duncan Spaeth) is an interesting re-examination of theories which have long been accepted. Two rather extended articles are suggested by the theories of Coleridge. Irene P. McKeehan, through a study of contemporary usage, tries to show how he distinguished the *sublime* from the *grand*, the *majestic*, and the *beautiful*. Earl Leslie Griggs uses Coleridge's phrase, "the willing suspension of disbelief," which enables us to enjoy works involving the supernatural, and, by applying it first to his Shakespearean criticism and afterward to his poetry, shows how skillfully the author put his theory into practice. Finally, "Robert Frost and the New England Tradition" (Charles Howell Foster) is an effective refutation of Malcolm Cowley's contention that Frost is not an author in the tradition of Hawthorne, Thoreau, and Emerson.

An excellent study of literary influences is "More Roots for *Leaves of Grass*" (Edna Davis Romig), which traces the indebtedness of Whitman to Emerson. The article is short, but the evidence quoted is highly significant and of major importance.

The fourteen Elizabethan studies vary widely as to subject matter and method. Baldwin Maxwell continues his careful research on the dates of early plays by assigning 1605 as the probable date of Middleton's *The Family of Love*. In two independent studies of one topic, Hardin Craig and T. M. Parrott consider the relative dates of *The Taming of the Shrew* and the non-Shakespearean

Taming of a Shrew. Professor Parrott refutes Dover Wilson and supports Sir Edmund Chambers by concluding that *A Shrew* is the older play and is Shakespeare's source. Professor Craig, without debating priority of date, revives ten Brink's theory that both plays go back to a lost original, of which *A Shrew* is a reported version and *The Shrew* an independent revision. Obviously, Professor Craig must win Professor Parrott's agreement before realizing his expressed wish that this question may now be considered settled.

Homer A. Watt presents some sensible observations on early stage methods, based on internal evidence in *Gammer Gurton's Needle*. "The Forced Gait of a Shuffling Nag" (Jack D. A. Ogilvy) draws from Shakespeare's phrase some conclusions as to his knowledge of horsemanship. Tucker Brooke's title "The Royal Fletcher and the Loyal Heywood" cleverly indicates both the two authors and the two plays used for comparison. Professor Brooke shows himself to be a master of elegant irony, as exemplified in his comment on Fletcher's play: "It is as hollow as a shell, as changeable as a dream, and is all seen through the purple mist of the famous Fletcherian overstuffed blank verse, with its dripping extra syllables and mazelike redundancies, which can be so urbane and so boisterous and so beguiling, which is indeed so well fitted to anything except the clear transmission of thought."

Howard Mumford Jones, in "The Image of the New World," makes an extended study of early writings about the Americas available to English readers and concludes that England's slow start as a colonizing power resulted largely from the "bad press" and unfavorable reputation of the New World among the English. His materials are a useful supplement to recent books on the voyagers (such as Professor Cawley's), but to me his central thesis is completely unproved, even on the basis of his own quotations. He is much nearer the truth in suggesting "political and economic indifference" as a possible reason for England's tardiness in the field. In fact, the earliest Spanish colonization was largely a gold rush. The English might have developed a similar enthusiasm if their explorers had found rich gold mines; but, failing this, it was more profitable to rob the Spaniards than to establish colonies of their own.

Marlowe is the subject of three interesting articles. George Coffin Taylor comments upon his predilection for the word *Now*. Richard Hillier's study of his imagery, though somewhat overloaded with quotations, shows genuine insight and rises to true eloquence in the final pages. Most significant of all, and perhaps the most valuable essay in the volume, is Hallett Smith's "Tamburlaine and the Renaissance." Smith finds the suggestion for Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* in Loys LeRoy's *La Vicissitude ou Variété des Choses en l'Univers* (1575). He shows how LeRoy affected Marlowe's con-

ception of the character and finds here the source for Tamburlaine's entrance in a chariot drawn by kings. He also presents, by courtesy of Gerald E. Bentley, the earliest known reference to Marlowe's authorship of *Tamburlaine*, dated in 1631.

In addition to items already mentioned, Shakespeare is the subject of four critical studies. Robert Hamilton Ball revives the theory that Cinthio's *Epitia* is a source for *Measure for Measure* and seeks to show the degree of indebtedness. Frank W. Cady discusses motivation in Shakespeare's tragedies. Robert Withington uses Shylock and Othello for a discussion of Shakespeare's views on race prejudice. George R. Kernodle explains the structural pattern of *King Lear* in terms of symphonic form. This interpretation of one art form in terms of another can be very illuminating, as in Longfellow's comparison of the *Divine Comedy* to a cathedral. Professor Kernodle has handled his subject well.

Space limitations will not permit discussion of the seven essays on educational theory, even though enlivened by the wit of Burges Johnson. Besides Professor Johnson, the contributors are E. A. Cross, Garland Greever, J. R. Macarthur, Richard Murphy, David H. Stevens, and George S. McCue. Majorie M. Kimmerle adds an interesting study of Norwegian-American place names.

The University of Colorado Press is to be congratulated upon the contents and the attractive format of this its latest publication. A half-tone portrait of Professor Reynolds adds value to the volume.

JOHN E. HANKINS

University of Kansas

Le Libertinage érudit dans la première moitié du XVII^e siècle.

Par RENÉ PINTARD. Paris, Boivin, 1943. 2 vol., p. 765. T. II, Notes et références, bibliographie, index.

La Mothe Le Vayer, Gassendi, Guy Patin. Etudes de bibliographie et de critique suivies de textes inédits de Guy Patin. Par RENÉ PINTARD. Paris, Boivin, 1943. Pp. 93. (Thèse secondaire.)

This scholarly doctoral dissertation, written in large part before 1932, published in 1938, recently acquired in two libraries of this country, is henceforth an indispensable contribution to the ever widening study of the erudite freethinkers of the 17th century. Its 57 pages of bibliography, 15 of which are manuscript sources from French, Italian, German and Austrian libraries, attest to the solid erudition of the work, yet nowhere does it become dryly learned (although the style in its 576 grand in-octavo pages of solid text

is sometimes diffuse), as its author has succeeded remarkably in evoking a "climat moral" and in reconstructing groups and ideas. Through these erudite pages, one moves about with ease among the learned freethinkers of France and one sees them enthusiastically and adroitly, even boldly, exchange ideas and cultivate friendships in the first quarter of the century, establish libertine academies in Paris and in the provinces, in Italy, Holland and Sweden, become more subtle and timid as surveillance increased, and with the death of some and the conversion of others, decline in influence toward the end of the second quarter.

Beginning with 16th century humanism, and tracing the weakening of the Aristotelian philosophy and the consequent uncertainty in relationships between reason and faith, the author indicates the rôle of the learned society as the incredulity contained in the rationalism and the paganism of men of letters of the first quarter of the century condensed into the *libertinage* of later years. Pintard points out that at a time when the simple communication of a book launched by the Jesuits was considered a crime of *lèse-majesté* and punishable by death, when the death penalty likewise threatened printers and book merchants, every erudite labor was by rigorous necessity collective: "les savants parisiens se tiennent les coudes." He vividly evokes the multiple libertine groups: Peiresc's circle in Aix, the Tétrade in Paris (Diodati, later replaced by Guy Patin, La Mothe Le Vayer, Naudé, Gassendi), the *cabinet* of the *frères* Dupuy, the "déniaisés" of Italy, the Académie Bourdelot, the group which Christine of Sweden gathered around her, etc.

With infinite skill and great knowledge of secondary currents, Pintard disengages from the reticences, *boutades*, and hypocritical contradictions, the various orientations and attempts at systems, and with the exception of Naudé, Gassendi and Le Vayer, finds no cohesive order, only scattered ideas. Ample pages are devoted to Naudé and his critical rationalism, to Le Vayer and the variations of his scepticism, and to the contradictory philosophies of Gassendi. While one comes to admire, with Pintard, the fervor for work and the hatred of hypocrisy of these skeptics, one realizes that because of gaps in their philosophy or through fear of risks, by their contradictions and subterfuges, they all fell short of establishing a system of thought.

Some of the most valuable contributions of the book result from the fact that the author has taken into account the chronology of the various erudite works, and hence has been able to trace the evolution in thought of their authors. We see Naudé, the young "studieux mécréant," quickly acquiring an encyclopedic knowledge, and at the age of 25, a Bayle "en puissance," formulating a whole "Discours de la méthode" of an erudite, recognizing that all philosophic systems contain only a part of truth, ascribing a

political origin to religion, but, as his youthful impetuosity becomes prudent rationalism, failing to treat great problems, his vigorous effort ending in a half-failure. One follows Naudé with keen interest in his enthusiastic pilgrimages across Europe in search of books for Mazarin's library, and witnesses with emotion his sorrow at its cruel dispersal: "l'œuvre de mes mains et le miracle de ma vie." As for La Mothe Le Vayer, we learn that the Stoic, Epicurean and skeptic inspiration of his *Dialogues d'Orasius Tubero* is attenuated into a sort of fideism under the patronage of Richelieu, is squarely denied in certain later treatises, and again reasserted, Le Vayer ending as he began, a skeptical philosopher. His libertine philosophy terminated largely in sterility for lack of courage to be logical and clear. Gassendi, "le vif et prompt et complaisant et faible Gassendi," pushed by his disciples farther than he would wish to go, tried to remain faithful to two contradictory systems: his spontaneous libertine philosophy and his calculated philosophy of Christianised Epicureanism. Through the various editions of his *Syntagma philosophicum* he made an entire about-face, denied all the elements of natural religion contained in its earlier forms, and finally "a de ses propres mains tué la philosophie libertine que, pendant maintes années, il avait portée en lui."

René Pintard concludes that although the erudite rationalism of the first half of the century ended in failure, without it the triumphant freethinking of Fontenelle and Bayle of the second half of the century could not have existed.

In the second work, *La Mothe Le Vayer, Gassendi, Guy Patin*, Pintard determines the chronology of the various editions of La Mothe Le Vayer's *Dialogues d'Orasius Tubero*, which contains the most audaciously skeptical formulae of the 17th century, which formulae are not found in the collective editions of his works. The same obligation exists with Gassendi, for which Pintard has had recourse to the austere study of the various manuscripts of the *Syntagma philosophicum*. Likewise to solve the problem which confronts every historian of 17th century rationalism, the value to be assigned to the *Naudæana* and the *Patiniana*, the writer has examined manuscript copies of these in Paris, Dijon, Wiesbaden, Munich and Vienna, and has investigated a third *ana*, *Borboniana*, which reveals a close relationship between the three collections, as well as between Le Vayer, Gassendi, Naudé and Patin.

Two manuscript fragments of the *Patiniana* are reproduced, one exposing piquant details on medical life in the first half of the century, the other displaying Guy Patin's manner of composing his notes and anecdotes.

MARY ELIZABETH STORER

Beloit College

Attitudes of Seventeenth-Century France toward the Middle Ages.

By NATHAN EDELMAN. New York: King's Crown Press, 1946. Pp. xvi + 460.

Dr. Edelman has read widely in writings of the Middle Ages and of the seventeenth century, as well as in scholarly productions of recent years. He discusses seventeenth-century scholars like Du Cange and Mabillon whose work has proved invaluable to students of the Middle Ages, the influence of medieval theology, the fame of medieval heroes—especially that of Clovis, Charles Martel, Charlemagne, Roland, Saint Louis, Joan of Arc,—echoes of chivalry and of medieval tales in novel, drama, and epic poetry, the appreciation by seventeenth-century authors of certain medieval writers, their mention of others. The work is a mine of information, whether the material has been unearthed by E. himself or by scholars he is careful to quote.

In his desire to contribute to knowledge E. has been led to emphasize awareness rather than ignorance of the Middle Ages, appreciation rather than disparagement. His introduction opens with the remark that "The Renaissance, it is said, abruptly erased the Middle Ages from man's memory," but he does not indicate the author of this foolish observation. Instead he quotes Chamard's *Origines*, in which, twenty-six years ago, its absurdity was clearly indicated. The only props I find in the book for the man of straw that E. would knock down are, p. xiv, a quotation from Léon Gautier, and, p. 397, one from Sainte-Beuve, but no one would look to the former for knowledge of the seventeenth century, while Sainte-Beuve was speaking only of poetry and was writing, as E. admits, at the age of twenty-four. It would hardly be fair, however, to say that E. has shattered an open door, for by collecting and accurately presenting a vast amount of material he has made it clear that the Middle Ages loomed larger in seventeenth-century consciousness than has hitherto been realized.

The work has been prepared with great care. I have few comments to make in regard to its details. I would not, however, put Marot among medieval authors,¹ nor include among seventeenth-century writers Fauchet, who died in 1601, or Pasquier, six of the seven books of whose *Recherches* were published before 1600. On p. 185 E. states that the main plot of Scudéry's *Prince déguisé* "comes from the *Primaleon*." Here he is following the late Miss Matulka, who sought at great length to establish this source, but M. Antoine Adam showed in 1937 that she was mistaken and that the main source of the play is Marino's *Adone*, Canto XIV.² On p. 261 E. cites Goedeke's *Grundriss*, V, 225, as the only authority for the existence of "a *Pucelle d'Orléans, tragédie en prose* (Paris,

¹ Cf. pp. 332, 395.

² Cf. the *Revue d'Histoire de la philosophie*, V, 25-37.

1667) by one Arnaud." He calls attention to Lanéry d'Arc's belief that Goedeke is in error and adds that I do not mention the tragedy. I would suggest that Goedeke, who was not a specialist in French literature, mistook for a seventeenth-century dramatist Charles Arnaud, who published in 1888 a book that mentions d'Aubignac's *Pucelle d'Orléans*, "tragédie en prose."³ I am glad to see that E. follows Schweitzer in attributing *Almahide* to Georges de Scudéry, rather than Mongrédien, who assigns it—by the analogy of the *Grand Cyrus* and *Clélie*—to Madeleine. If our friend Louis Cons, to whom E.'s book is dedicated, ever read the remarks that now constitute note 47 on p. 374, he must have been pleased by E.'s statement in regard to Alexis as the author of *Pathelin*, and, if the late Professor Holbrook had read them, he would have added E.'s name to the list he kept of "adhésions," but I fear that most medievalists will not agree that either Holbrook or Cons ever proved that Alexis was the author of the famous comedy.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

L'Orient romanesque en France 1704-1789. By MARIE-LOUISE DUFRENOY. Montréal: Éditions Beauchemin, 1946. Pp. 380.

As the title of the book implies, Miss Dufrenoy is interested only in the short story and the novel, whether philosophical, epistolary or otherwise. She shows how, after the publication of D'Herbelot's *Bibliothèque orientale*, Galland's *Mille et une nuits*, and Petis de la Croix's *Mille et un jours*, the matière d'Orient became popular, and how it was exploited by different writers either for lasciviousness as in the contes gallants after Crébillon fils, or in the satire as exemplified by Montesquieu's *Lettres persanes*, or for expressing under cover and popularizing genetics, philosophical, scientific, political and sociological ideas. So that, generally speaking, Miss Dufrenoy's study leads to the same conclusion as Mr. Martino's thesis, *L'Orient dans la lit. fr. au XVII^e et au XVIII^e siècle*, published exactly forty years earlier. If we take into account the fact that the apex of this type of literature was reached between 1740 and 1760, the orientalist movement can be considered as another manifestation of the underground movement which I. O. Wade studied in his *Clandestine organization and philosophical ideas in*

³ There appeared in 1642 two editions, one of d'Aubignac's prose tragedy, the other of its translation into French verse by Benserade or La Mesnardière. More than two centuries later these were discussed by Arnaud. Goedeke failed to mention d'Aubignac, attributed his play, with an erroneous date, to Arnaud, and listed two verse tragedies instead of one, equitably assigning one to Benserade, the other to La Mesnardière!

France from 1700 to 1750. And we can conclude with Mr. Wade that the fearless expression of ideas should not be confined to the group of thinkers writing after 1750, but that the first half of the century should be included to represent liberal and progressive thought just as much as the second.

The chief interest in Miss Dufrenoy's work lies in her statistical data and the breaking down of the different genres. I think, however, that the book suffers a little from over classification. Maupertuis' *Vénus physique* could well fit in the second half of the book in spite of its "pointe d'érotisme." Particularly exciting is her analysis of *Le Sopha* of Crébillon fils and the pornographic literature it gave rise to; particularly new is her examination of Melon's *Mahmoud*. Here too, I am inclined to believe that Miss Dufrenoy seeks a little too much significance in the works of most of the authors. There is too much tendency to discount good gallic humor in the libidinous century of enlightenment. The descriptive passage she cites from *Candide*: "les marchés ornés de mille colonnes . . ." (p. 219) is not necessarily an "imitation en charge des contes arabes"; it can as well be a take off on the writers of fairy tales or utopistic writers. I should like to give in full the passage in *Zadig* partially cited on p. 309:

Alors elle laissa voir le sein le plus charmant que la nature ait jamais formé: un bouton de rose sur une pomme d'ivoire n'eût paru auprès que de la garance sur du buis, et les agneaux sortant du lavoir auraient semblé d'un jaune brun. Cette gorge, ses grands yeux noirs qui languissaient en brillant doucement d'un feu tendre, ses joues animées de la plus belle pourpre mêlée au blanc de lait le plus pur, son nez, qui n'était pas comme la tour du mont Liban, ses lèvres, qui étaient comme deux bordures de corail renfermant les plus belles perles de la mer d'Arabie; tout cela ensemble fit croire au vieillard qu'il avait vingt ans,

and suggest that even in the eighteenth century the Bible, especially the Song of Songs, can not be neglected in the study of works assumed to have oriental coloring.

Wrapped up in the interesting problem of correlating ideas, Miss Dufrenoy forgets at times that a book has a technical angle. She cites names of authors without giving the titles of their books. A bibliography would have been helpful, and the index leaves something to be desired. Mais ce ne sont que des vétilles.

EMILE MALAKIS

Dramatic Parody by Marionettes in Eighteenth Century Paris. By FRANK W. LINDSAY. New York; King's Crown Press, 1946. Pp. 185.

Dr. Lindsay discusses thirty-five parodies, chiefly of operas, tragedies, and comedies, acted by marionettes between 1725 and

1760. Their authors include Lesage, Fuzelier, Carolet, Favart, and Piron. Recently revived operas by Quinault and recently acted tragedies by Voltaire, La Motte, and Danchet are prominent among the works parodied. Sufficient comment is made in regard to the objects of attack and the devices employed by the parodists, whose aims were, as L. insists, to amuse an audience rather than to guide public taste or to diminish the popularity of the operas and plays involved. That parody, however, at times left a sting is shown by La Motte's protests and by its use at the Foire in revenge for persecution by actors of the Comédie-Française.

The discussion of the parodies is preceded by an account of certain books that have dealt with marionettes, with parody, or with the Foire, and by a chapter entitled "The Development of the Théâtre de la Foire, 1595-1762." It is mainly in this part of L.'s book that I have found a number of errors.

On p. 15 L. has been misled by Bonnassies. An examination of the *Registre de La Grange* would have shown him that at least one Parisian theater was not "virtually deserted." Molière, moreover, did not take Michel Baron from Mme Raisin's troupe, but from that of the duc de Savoie, of which he was a member in 1669, the year before he joined Molière. Nor did his departure from her troupe cause its dissolution, for it was playing at Dijon and at Lyons in 1673.

More serious for those interested in the first use of the name "Comédie-Française" is the insertion of this term where it does not belong. According to L. (p. 15), the unified Parisian troupes were, in 1680, given "the exclusive privilege of presenting plays in Paris, under the name of *La Comédie-Française*." This statement is supported (p. 170) by a quotation purporting to come from the *Grande Encyclopédie*, that reads ". . . sadite Majesté veut que ladite seule troupe de la Comédie Française puisse représenter les comédies dans Paris." But the *Grande Encyclopédie* does not give the words "de la Comédie Française," nor does La Grange when he quotes the same *lettre de cachet*. I have found no evidence that the term existed in the seventeenth century. It was certainly not employed in the document that L. cites.

P. 16. "We have also a police memorandum of 1646, signed by La Reynie." There must be an error either in the date or in the name, for in 1646 La Reynie was a young man, living in southern France. His well-known connection with the police began in 1661, when he was made maître des requêtes. He became lieutenant only in 1667.

P. 21. "Lesage began his career at the fairs under the auspices of the daughter of the widow Maurice, Madame Baron, whom he knew through her husband, the illustrious actor of the Comédie-Française." It is not known how Lesage met Mme Baron. Her husband was not Michel Baron, as L. implies. At the time when

she produced Lesage's Foire plays, she was the widow of Michel's son Etienne, whom she had accused of greeting her with "coups de pied et de poing" and who, for her comfort, had died on Dec. 9, 1711.

P. 42. "The prices of seats for this performance were 'au double,' i. e., twice the regular price." This statement is only approximately correct. A play could be "au double" when prices were doubled in some parts of the house and not in others.

P. 164. La Motte's use of children in *Inès de Castro* (1723) "was a daring innovation on the stage of the Comédie-Française." Hardly. They had been introduced into a good many comedies, and, as *Athalie* had been acted at the Comédie thirty-five times in 1716-22, Nadal's *Antiochus* seven times in 1722, La Motte had these examples to follow when he wrote his tragedy.

These slips do not diminish the value of the work, so far as its principal theme, marionette parody, is concerned. L.'s book makes a genuine, though minor contribution to the history of French eighteenth-century theatrical enterprises.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

Gide, Freedom and Dostoevsky. By MISCHA HARRY FAYER.
(Printed at the Lane Press, Burlington, Vt., 1946). Pp. 159.

In the final paragraph of *Thésée*, André Gide—using Theseus as his mouthpiece for a moving valedictory after a literary career of more than fifty years—affirms: "Il m'est doux de penser qu'après moi, que par moi, les hommes se reconnaîtront plus heureux, meilleurs et plus libres. Pour le bien de l'humanité future, j'ai fait mon œuvre. J'ai vécu." This page appeared too late to be considered in this Columbia University dissertation, but Dr. Fayer's study supports the author's own estimate of his rôle by showing that "unremitting search for human freedom is the unifying trait in Gide's personality and outlook and the key to an unequivocal understanding of his message" and that he cannot be denied a place in "the galaxy of Frenchmen who, throughout the centuries, have carried the torch of progress."

Part I deals with Gide's "Satanic" period, prior to the first World War, in which the author of *Les Nourritures terrestres* "sees individualism as synonymous with self-realization" and "preconizes egotism and hedonism and views life from the esthetic rather than from the social angle." This part also studies the "transitional" period, in which Gide, profoundly stirred by the War and aided by "an essentially Dostoevskyan conception of Christianity" makes a "reevaluation of his former values," ulti-

mately evolving "from restless and perplexed search to serenity and synthesis." Part II is concerned with Gide's effort, in writings since 1918, to integrate his new values into a coherent philosophy. The different phases of this "seraphic" period, as well as the critic's concern to link them all with his unifying criterion, are indicated by the chapter titles: "Personal Liberation and Self-Approval," "Liberation from Superannuated Psychology," "Liberation from Conventional Esthetics," "Liberation from Transcendentalism," "Liberation from Traditional Ethics," and "Liberation from the Existing Social Order." Throughout the study, Dostoevsky is used in a subsidiary way further to elucidate Gide's attitude and thought.

Gide's most cherished ideas have been set forth so often and so explicitly in his works that they have long been familiar to his readers. Lalou, Gouiran, and other critics have indicated his *rapproches* with Dostoevsky, though Gide's own writings on the Russian master really leave little for the critic to add about this significant literary relationship. Mr. Fayer's thesis, nevertheless, has the merit of being the first lengthy study devoted entirely to showing Gide's underlying constancy and to relating every phase of his ideology to his basic concern for human freedom and progress. Though certainly more objective than hostile critics like Massis, Mr. Fayer shows a strong counter-tendency to idealize and idolize the heroic figure of Gide as a great constructive thinker and to exaggerate the "serenity" of his maturity and old age. Opposing views are neither stated nor expressly refuted, so that too often Gide's ideas appear to win by default. With respect to *Corydon*, for example, though Mr. Fayer terms Gide's arguments "specious," he passes on too hastily for one to feel that his attitude toward his hero is entirely impartial. (Incidentally, the profound influence of Gide's sexual anomaly on his thought and writing is scarcely suggested in this book.)

Despite many debatable points, Mr. Fayer has marshalled sufficient evidence from Gide's writings to prove, I think, consistency of aim throughout his career, as well as the essential coherence of his thought and message after the "Satanic" period. This thesis will not, of course, convince the Catholic anti-Gidians of the truth and value of that message, for it serves rather to focus sharper light upon the irreconcilable differences between Gide and his orthodox opponents. Even the latter, however, must recognize that Gide has insisted, in all except his earliest writings, upon discipline and self-abnegation rather than egoism and hedonism as the real touchstones of human freedom. In this connection, Mr. Fayer might well have distinguished explicitly between Gide's own moral and social philosophy and "le gidisme" which his disciples of the first post-war generation drew from his early writings and continued to read into later works, ignoring the author's personal

example and his counsel ("Nathanaël, jette mon livre!") to "passer outre."

Gide, Freedom and Dostoevsky is a thought-provoking and, I think, a valuable interpretation of Gide's ideological development and his message. But Gide the artist—to my mind perhaps a more genuinely creative figure than the moralist or social reformer—is strangely neglected. If it is true that a purely esthetic interpretation has the drawback of focusing attention on "only one aspect of Gide's creation, thus restricting it in scope and import," the remedy is certainly not simply to exclude esthetic considerations entirely. Ramon Fernandez was right in asserting that Gide is not "un pur artiste"; he is, nevertheless, *an* artist of genius, and many of the "ideas" which Mr. Fayer studies should be considered in the light of this essential fact, though one need not take literally Gide's plea: "Le point de vue esthétique est le seul où il faille se placer pour parler de mon œuvre sainement."

This study is well planned and well written, though there is a little too much pointing to the plan in the introduction and thereafter. The documentation, largely from Gide's and Dostoevsky's writings, is copious and well selected. An adequate bibliography is provided, as well as an index. A disturbing number of misprints, especially in French citations, and of slight inaccuracies and inconsistencies in titles and references occur in text, footnotes, and bibliography. While regrettable, such flaws do not impair the real merit of this serious and stimulating interpretation of a major literary figure, and Mr. Fayer's contribution belongs on the same shelf with the books by Fernandez, Lalou, Hytier, and other outstanding critics of Gide and his works. More than any previous study, perhaps, it suggests the true meaning for our time and for the future of Gide's message of human freedom and progress.

CARLOS LYNES, JR.

University of Pennsylvania

Les origines et la formation de la littérature courtoise en Occident (500-1200); Première partie, *La tradition impériale de la fin de l'antiquité au XI^e siècle*. By RETO R. BEZZOLA. Bibliothèque de l'école des Hautes Études, CLXXXVI. Paris: Champion, 1944. Pp. xxii, 396.

It is always difficult to review the first volume of a two volume work. The effectiveness of the presentation of background material can hardly be judged until one knows what use is to be made of it in the main part of the work. The detached chapter from the

forthcoming second volume, "Guillaume IX et les origines de l'amour courtois," that has appeared in *Romania* does not fill this need. Moreover, in writing the volume at hand Professor Bezzola had several avowed purposes that were not entirely compatible. On the first page of his "avant-propos" he states that the object of this volume is to retrace as far as possible the intellectual and literary life of the lay courts from the end of classical times to the twelfth century. But on the next page he says that he plans to make an inventory of all the writers attached to these courts. These two tasks are too much for three hundred and twenty-three pages. The inventory is there. Reinforced as it is with brief summaries of what is known about the writers and excellent bibliographical notes, it should be an extremely useful tool for students of the period. This alone is enough to establish this book as a useful work of erudition.

Intellectual history is, however, far more than a list of authors with some comment on their lives and literary style. It involves a meticulous and reasonably complete analysis of their ideas. Professor Bezzola does not make any serious attempt to supply this. He is interested only in those ideas that seem to him to have a bearing on the development of "La littérature courtoise." This is perfectly proper in a work devoted to that subject, but it should not be called the intellectual history of the period. Unfortunately this reviewer has been unable to discover just what Professor Bezzola means by "Littérature courtoise." At times he seems to mean any literature produced at a court. Then again it is clear that he means a special type of literature, but just what type is never explained. Undoubtedly these difficulties will be removed by the second volume. Until it appears one cannot judge the effectiveness of the analysis of the ideas in question or whether the ideas themselves are really pertinent to the author's subject.

Professor Bezzola seems to have a basic idea much like that expressed in Merejkowski's famous trilogy—a continuing struggle between the lay and clerical worlds, between Christian and anti-Christian. This is an excellent generalization for use in undergraduate teaching and in popular literature, but it is an oversimplification that can easily lead a scholar astray. Mediaeval Christianity was not a pure religious ideal but a compromise between the ideal and the realities of human nature. While no student of the Middle Ages can deny the existence of anti-Christian or at least non-Christian ideas, the conception of a lay world at war with a clerical one seems to be of very doubtful validity.

Fortunately the value of this volume does not depend on the validity of this general conception. Although much of the book is taken up with the inventory of little known writers, Professor Bezzola has written suggestive and stimulating chapters on those that interested him most. His favorite is clearly Fortunatus in

whom he sees the beginning of the idealization of woman that was to play so important a part in courtly literature. In his search for the origins of the "Littérature courtoise" Professor Bezzola has clearly established three points—a reasonable continuity of literary activity in the lay courts of the early Middle Ages, the high position held by women as patrons of the court writers, and the existence in elementary form of some of the central ideas of twelfth century literature. Only the appearance of his second volume can show whether or not these will adequately serve his purpose in elucidating "Les origines et la formation de la littérature courtoise en Occident."

SIDNEY PAINTER

The Johns Hopkins University

French Farce and John Heywood. By IAN MAXWELL. Melbourne and London: Melbourne University Press and Oxford University Press, 1946. Pp. 175. 12/6.

This is that *rarissima avis*, a book of profound scholarship written with winsome lightness of touch, a penetrating investigation of indebtedness that nevertheless keeps constantly in view the larger problems of literary criticism. Maxwell modestly says that his work merely develops the theme of Young's article of 1904 (*MP.* II, pp. 97 ff., not 109 ff. as cited on p. 167), but it is soon evident that he does much more. As he wisely remarks, "the fact of plagiarism has little importance in itself. In his own small way Heywood was an artist, and he deserves to be treated as such" (12).

The general conclusions of the volume can be briefly summarized: Heywood's plays in their homely realism and desire to entertain rather than instruct have many affinities with French farces and almost none with the works of any English predecessors; every one of the plays has a French analogue or betrays a family resemblance to some French dramatic type, and Heywood's improvements on his sources reveal a French, not an English, technique (see p. 107). Maxwell says that it is not the bricks (which are often English) but the style of architecture as a whole that foreign models have influenced, and he repeatedly shows how Heywood confidently and independently made his borrowed models his own (116-120). Yet page after page persuasively develops the thesis that the English writer must have been in touch with the French theatre of his day and must have known the dramatic characters, situations and stylistic devices of a wide-ranging French repertory.

Students both of Heywood and of the French farces will find

many enlightening incidental observations scattered throughout the book. Of *Le Garçon et l'aveugle* the author says, "In its brevity, its steely vim, and its tom-cat morality, this little play is closely linked with the farces of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries" (16). The distinguishing and overlapping characteristics of farce, sottie, monologue and morality are clearly set forth (17-23). In Chapter II (The Matter of Farce) the plots and intimate pictures of ordinary life in the French comedies are carefully analyzed and contrasted with the subjects of the English plays. Chapter III (The Art of Farce) investigates with a keen ear and incisive observation the use of split lines, repetitions, systematic equivocations and other stylistic traits. (See for example such a suggestion as that on p. 44, "farce rarely succumbs to the temptations of a purely perverse ingenuity. Its artifice is expressive, and even such a sweetmeat as the triolet is seldom entirely adventitious.")

Chapters v (Pernet and John), vi (*La farce d'un pardonneur, Pardoner and Friar, The Four PP*) and vii (*Le fou et le sage, Witty and Witless*) examine in great detail the evidence for and against specific relationships. The evidence is judicially weighed (no fingers added) and often enough the conclusion is reached that general similarities which might alone be of little force nevertheless carry conviction by their numbers and by the lack of English analogues.

Three Appendices containing a useful list of French farces, an examination of the dates of some of them, and a discussion of certain French plots found in English jest books (among them the plots of *Pathelin* and the lost *Femme muette*) complete a volume that can be recommended not only to those who would discover how Heywood worked and adapted the material he appropriated, but to all who enjoy good scholarship decked in imaginative prose and adorned by keen critical understanding.¹

GRACE FRANK

Bryn Mawr College

¹ A few suggestions are added for what they may be worth. In the first chapter one misses any reference to *Courtois d'Arras*, to Bédier's excellent article in *Revue des Deux Mondes* (1890) xcix, 869 ff., to J.-P. Jacobsen, *La Comédie en France au moyen âge* (1910) or to *MLR* xxxi (1936), 377. The discussions of Droz's *Recueil Trepperel* might well have been equated with Ph. Aug. Becker's "Die Narrenspiele des neuentdeckten Mischbands von Treppereldrucken" (Berichte über die Verh. d. Sächsischen Akademie, Ph.-Hist. Kl., 87, 2, 1935). Holbrook's date of *Pathelin*, 1464, is accepted without question from the 1924 edition in *CFMA*, but the second revised edition of 1937 and the works there cited make this date uncertain.

Mittelhochdeutsches Lesebuch. Texte des vierzehnten Jahrhunderts. Herausgegeben von SAMUEL SINGER. Bern: Verlag A. Francke, 1945. 115 pp.

Dieses im Umfang und Preis erfreulich bescheidene *Lesebuch* beschränkt sich auf Texte des 14. Jahrhunderts, "um—mit Singers Worten—endlich mit einem noch immer verbreiteten Vorurteil aufzuräumen, daß es tote Jahrhunderte gebe, von denen nur der Fachgelehrte der Vollständigkeit halber Notiz zu nehmen brauche, während der sogenannte Gebildete an ihnen achtlos vorübergehen dürfe." Tatsächlich hat von den Germanisten des 19. Jh. kaum einer ausser Pfeiffer sich der Texte des unklassischen Zeitalters angenommen, und erst mit Philipp Strauch hat ernsthafte Bemühung um das Verständnis der mystischen Schriften des 14. Jh. eingesetzt. In den letzten zwei Jahrzehnten sind dann die Spätzeiten des Mittelalters immer genauer von Philologen und Kulturhistorikern beachtet worden; Bücher wie Huizingas *Herbst des Mittelalters* oder Stadelmanns, *Vom Geist des ausgehenden Mittelalters* haben weite Kreise gezogen und viele Untersuchungen angeregt, wovon die Reflexe auch hierzulande deutlich werden. Ich verweise z. B. auf die Anzeige der Stanforder Germanisten Morgan und Strothmann, die Herausgabe einer einzigartigen Thomas-Übersetzung des 14. Jh. betreffend (vgl. dazu *GQ* xix [1946] 219). Nichts scheint mir für das gegenwärtige Interesse an der Literatur des 14. Jh. so bezeichnend wie der Umstand, daß ein so 'klassischer' Germanist wie Singer in seinem hohen Alter noch sich genötigt und bereit findet, dem Gebot der Stunde zu folgen und die klassischen Lesebücher des deutschen Mittelalters um eines zu ergänzen, das zeitlich vom Meister Eckart bis zum *Ackermann aus Böhmen* reicht. Bei einem solchen Buch kann es nicht anders sein, als daß seine stärksten Stücke aus dem Bereich der *Mystik* kommen. Beseelt von ihrem Geist sind nicht nur die direkten Beispiele (Eckarts Traktat, eine Tauler-Predigt, eine Eckart-Legende, Seuses autobiographische Skizze), sondern auch der Brief einer Klosterfrau, ein geistliches Lied, ein religiöses Drama, oder Heinrichs von Neustadt religiöses Epos von *Gotes zuokunft*; Aufrührung und Erschütterung der Seele durch die Mystik klingt ja sogar noch 1400 nach in der kunstvoll gezimmerten Rhetorenprosa des *Ackermann*.

Der gewaltige Anteil der Mystik an der Literatur des 14. Jh. hat nicht nur geistesgeschichtliche, sondern zugleich auch sprachgeschichtliche Konsequenzen. Als eine Gotteswissenschaft für Alle spricht die Mystik ein 'klassenloseres' Deutsch als etwa die klassizistische Versnovelle oder der Ritterroman. Ihre 'sozialisierte' Theologie manifestiert sich in einem Deutsch, das von dem der Ritterwelt so entfernt ist wie die mystische Gottesschau von dem

Dogma der offiziellen Kirche. Mit andern Worten: Die Sprache der Mystik ist nicht mehr Mittelhochdeutsch.

Es ist von äusserstem Interesse, anhand von Singers Buch zu sehen, daß nicht etwa sein jüngster Text (*Ackermann*) der dem Neuhochdeutschen schon nächste ist, sondern ein mindestens 80 Jahre älterer, thüringischer, das *Spiel von den zehn Jungfrauen* (dessen Eisenacher Aufführung den Landgrafen Friedrich so erschütterte, daß er körperlich krank wurde). Wem fiel bei der Erwähnung Eisenachs nicht Luther ein, so daß sich der Schluß aufdrängt: das 'Neuhochdeutsche' im *Jungfrauenspiel* sei eben sein Ostmitteldeutsch; der Mundartboden, aus dem es spriesse, sei ja der Geburtsacker des späteren Neuhochdeutsch. Tatsächlich aber zeigen andere ostmd. Texte bei Singer ein recht intaktes Mhd., wie denn auch grade im ostmd. Preußen die höfische Epik eine lange Nachblüte erlebt. Da erweist sich denn, daß Nhd. nicht einfach nur die Sprache einer jüngeren Zeit oder eines neuen Sprachraums ist. Weil es für das religiöse Spiel—wenigstens in deutscher Sprache—keine höfisch-klassischen Traditionen gab (so wenig wie für den mystischen Traktat), keine verbindliche Form und fertig-feste Sprache, ist der Dichter hier frei für ein moderneres Deutsch. Singers Buch zeigt in schlagenden Beispielen, wie stark das bürgerliche Minnelied, das Lehrgedicht, die Versnovelle, die Fabel durch Konvention und Tradition an das ritterliche Mittelalter und seine Sprachwelt fixiert ist; damit ein Text sich daraus löse, ist neben einer Lösung aus Zeit und Raum der bisherigen Sprachwelt ein Geistig-Seelisches nötig: eine neue, bisher noch nie zur Sprache gebrachte Aussage, für die die gemässe Sprache zu finden der Dichter völlig frei ist. Und so bildete sich das neue Deutsch der mystischen Traktate, der religiösen Dramen, der Plenarien und Perikopen.

Es bezeichnet den Rang des *Lesebuchs*, daß es Erwägungen dieser Art ermöglicht, indem es ihnen die sprachgeschichtlichen Unterlagen liefert, ja auf seinen 67 Textseiten (die freilich durch 45 Seiten Glossar glänzend unterstützt werden) die verzweifelt schwere Aufgabe löst, die zahllosen, oft ineinander fließenden, einander aufhebenden Konturen einer *Übergangsepoche* so zu fassen, daß sichtbar und belegbar wird, wie vielschichtig, in vielen Farben schillernd, wie dialektisch das 'tote' Jahrhundert ist.—Dem mit äusserster Sorgfalt gedruckten Buch, das den Altmeister der Germanistik in gewohnter kritischer Wachheit zeigt, ist ein hervorragender Platz in unserm Unterricht sicher.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

Hölderlin. By AGNES STANSFIELD. (Publications of the University of Manchester, No. CCLXXXIX) Manchester University Press, 1944. Pp. ii + 130.

There has been in England during these last ten years a remarkable interest in the personality and works of Friedrich Hölderlin, for since Miss Butler's *Tyranny of Greece*, Miss Stansfield's book is the fourth monograph on the poet besides Mr. Closs' edition and several translations of the poems. Based on a sound knowledge of secondary sources and her own first-hand study of Hölderlin's work, Miss Stansfield presents us with a vivid and sympathetic picture of the poet and an account of his growth and decline. The strength of the book lies undoubtedly on the biographical side, for although she illustrates the lyrical importance of Hölderlin—for those who are unable to read the originals—with able translations of her own, she seems to attach almost greater weight to the importance of Hölderlin's philosophy. Her appraisal, however, is too subjective and not buttressed by evidence and documentation. She also inclines—similarly to those biographers of Kleist who take sides with the dramatist against Goethe—toward attributing undue blame to Schiller's attitude toward Hölderlin.

Schiller saw clearly enough that his advice would be of little avail to the poet. He who paid dearly for his undertakings in the publishing of periodicals, dissuaded his young admirer from founding a journal in order to better his financial situation, and Hölderlin misjudged such warnings as an unwillingness of the older man to help his young and dangerous rival. Schiller's admonition "Bleiben Sie der Sinnenwelt näher" shows his clear recognition of Hölderlin's weakness, which Goethe also characterized with these words, "Der Dichter scheine mit der Natur nur durch Überlieferung bekannt zu sein," observations which are certainly not unfounded. It must also not be forgotten that Schiller, at the height of his fame and glory, was a doomed man, wrestling with all his strength from an undermined constitution his great and manly works, such as his magnificent dramas and his acute and laborious philosophical studies, while Hölderlin, no doubt the greater lyric poet, could vie with his revered but secretly berated model neither in compass of production, strength of personality, width of horizon, nor systematic schooling of thought. On the other hand, the vagueness of Hölderlin's pantheistic cosmos probably contributed no little to the beauty of his elegiac poetry. However, the fact that its underlying philosophy preceded in time the systematic presentation of similar ideas by Schelling and Hegel should not be used as an argument for its greater merit, as Miss Stansfield does.

The weakness of Hölderlin's philosophy and poetry lies in a lack of tangibility and individuation. He himself is not unaware of the fact that his purely spiritual and hence abstract striving makes life

so unhappy for him and that he might have approached a realization of his ideals through a life in closer contact with nature and men; yet, he scorned this as a waste of his genius, whose calling, he believed, was to praise the Gods, Ether and Earth, whom he knew by theoretical and esthetic contemplation only. To be sure, this was his fate and he embraced it with an instinctive *amor fati*—which makes his poetry what it is. But recognizing this tragic concatenation we must not blame it on others.

Even though Miss Stansfield's fervent devotion to her task leads her to excessive claims for her hero—common to recent German biographers of Hölderlin¹—it should win new friends for a great elegiac poet too long neglected in English-speaking countries if not in his own.

ERNST FEISE

The Johns Hopkins University

CORRESPONDENCE

THE STATE OF LINGUISTICS: CRISIS OR REACTION? In an article bearing the title given above (*Italica* XXIII, 30-4), Mr. Robert A. Hall Jr. has stated that the mentalistic approach to linguistics is to be identified with "reaction," whereas the mechanistic approach means progress; and that no such crisis as the one I had pointed out in a previous article (*Italica* XXI, 154-169), is in existence. I may be allowed to make the following comments on Mr. Hall's article:

(1). Mr. Hall has attempted to show that the two essential innovations in nineteenth and twentieth-century linguistics: the postulates "that phonetic change follows regular patterns" and "that form (significant sounds and their combinations [not meaning]) is to be used as a primary basis for analysis," are of a non-mentalistic character—and that, therefore, the progress in nineteenth and twentieth-century linguistics is due to non-mentalism. These two postulates, obviously, could apply only to phonetics: not to word-formation, morphology, semantics, syntax or

¹ I quote the first paragraph from a monograph by E. Kurt Fischer (Propyläen-Verlag, 1938): "Friedrich Hölderlin, ein Jahrhundert lang verkannt, mißdeutet, geistig mißbraucht, ward seinem Volke in den Schicksalstagen des Weltkrieges durch den Weckruf begeisterter Jugend Prophet einer größeren Zukunft. Weggewischt wurde mit eins das schwächliche Bild des lebensunfähigen Romantikers, des unglücklichen Schillerepigon, des weltfremden lyrischen Monomanen, dessen letzte vier Jahrzehnte schlechte Romanschriftsteller reizten und gewissenlose Zeitungsschreiber zu gewagten Mutmaßungen über die Ursachen seines geistigen Erlöschens verlockten."

stylistics; thus, for a Romance scholar, Mr. Hall's picture of linguistics would comprise only the matter treated in Volume I of Meyer-Lübke's Grammar.

Should we infer, then, from Mr. Hall's summary that there has not, or cannot, have been any progress in nineteenth and twentieth-century linguistics, in the fields which one may call, in a broader sense, the *semantic* ones? What makes Mr. Hall so reticent about fields he himself is less apt to cultivate is evidently the fact that it is the 'regularity' of sound-shifts and sound-patterns that he finds more deserving of scholarly analysis. For him, the natural sciences are statistical by nature, and linguistics should follow them in this respect. But the so-called phonetic *laws*, precisely because they are 'statistical statements,' are basically no different from the so-called semantic *tendencies*, which for example, Professor Sperber postulates; both are statistical in nature, and it may happen, as Mr. Hall must confess ("the assumption of regular phonetic change does not in the slightest depend on the frequency or proportion of its exemplification"), that a phonetic law is 'overlaid'¹ by disturbing features (or by another phonetic law, or tendency, cf. Pușcariu on the two co-existing laws governing the fate of initial *qua-* in Romanian, *Beih. z. ZRPh* XXVI). Not essentially different is the situation with the semantic tendency, stated by Sperber, of the expansion of metaphors of 'building' in the Baroque Age (which tendency may be counteracted by other Baroque tendencies, and therefore does not attain to 'regularity'); the two sets of laws or tendencies differ only in dosage.

Now we are asked to believe that the consideration of statistic regularity and the predictability of results make linguistics more scientific, i. e. more similar to the natural sciences—but has there not been in these sciences themselves a development, in recent times, toward recognition of the basically statistical character of the so-called 'natural laws'? Would, then, modern physics, because it has ceased to be a science of regularity, cease to be a science? It would seem that the linguistic mechanists are clinging to an obsolete conception of science which has been abandoned in the very sciences they purportedly wish to imitate.

¹ Mr. Hall, gives, as an example of this 'overlying,' "the seventeenth-century French change of *r* to *z*." He must mean, on the contrary, the counteraction against the 14-16th century sound-change *r* > *z* (*Maria* > *Mazia*). But this process of counteraction against a popular trend is the clearest example of a revolt on the part of an aesthetically aroused élite, that is, a cultural, a mental step taken by a linguistic community. Only *chaise*, *nasiller*, *bésicles* have escaped the social taboo laid down by the 17th-century grammarians and observed by their followers—who have, to use Prof. Lerch's felicitous expression, "durchetymologisiert," i. e. compared the French words with their Latin etymons (as far as they could recognize them) and reestablished the etymological sound in nearly all the French forms. But it is *always* because some such repressive stand has been taken by a community opposed to change that any imminent sound-shift has failed to occur—and stability is more characteristic of language than is change: the preservation of sounds unchanged is the greatest 'regularity' of language.

And is it true that the two postulates laid down for phonetics are non-mentalistic in character? As for the first, it is well known that phonetic laws are stated by linguists on the basis of evident etymologies, i. e. of the identity of *meaning* obtaining in the words compared (*pater*, *πατήρ*, *pitá*, all mean 'father'); thus the statement of a phonetic law is conditioned by a previous mentalistic consideration. Moreover, the numerous exceptions to phonetic laws are due to mental factors, as the neo-grammarians themselves were the first to acknowledge: analogy, dialectal or learned (i. e. cultural) influences are mental factors. The so-called *accidenti generali* (sporadic sound-changes such as assimilation, dissimilation, metathesis) are commonly recognized as of a mental nature. And, finally, how would one explain the development of a phonetic law itself except by a mental procedure on the part of the speakers? (Schuchardt has suggested the possibility of 'lautliche Analogie,' and Menéndez Pidal has shown Spanish phonetic laws to be the consequence of cultural developments.)

As for the second postulate, modern phonology has introduced into linguistics the discovery of the phoneme or sound-pattern, that is of the conceptions held by the speaking community about the range and limits of the sounds it pronounces, these conceptions being felt as distinct units in opposition to each other. Miss Elise Richter has rightly stated that the task incumbent upon the linguists to come is the translation of 'phonetic' into 'phonological' laws. It is this more recent idea about the mental character of the sound-patterns which has enabled us to understand the relative regularity, previously pointed out by the neo-grammarians, with which phonetic laws operate within a language, as well as the 'Gleichschritt,' that is the parallelism in the development of two distinct sounds (e. g. $\varphi > ie$ parallel to $\varphi > uo$). In any case, it is only a change in the *conception* of the sounds which can explain the regularity of the changes. Mr. Hall, in declaring the progress in phonetics and phonology to be of a non-mentalistic nature, confuses the mechanical and statistical techniques of linguists, that are derived from their ideas about the nature of sounds and sound-change, with these ideas themselves. If we compare the mere discovery of regularity in sound-shifts and in the grouping of sounds, with the discovery of the inner forces in man that produce the outwardly observable regularity of his language, we must date real progress in linguistics from the latter—which, alone, can be called a 'Galileo-like' achievement (as Rousseau said: "Il faut beaucoup de philosophie pour observer une fois ce qu'on voit tous les jours").

(2). Mr. Hall tends to assume that American linguistic scholarship stands for 'progress' and European linguistic scholarship for 'reaction' (with its mentalistic approach, the consequence of Europe's "aristocratic, theological background of medieval and Renaissance intellectualism"). Since European-born linguists who, by nature, would apply mentalistic procedures, are treated by him as indulging in un-American activities, the next logical step for Mr. Hall would be to encourage the establishment of an academic FBI.

We must be deeply grateful to Mr. Hall for his startling revelations of the meaning and scope of the behavioristic movement in linguistics. It is from the naïvely fanatic rank-and-file soldier that we can learn the most about the actual appeal of the cause for which he is fighting; the Commander-in-Chief may still have retained a sense of humor and of proportion: often when I read some of the anti-mentalistic pronouncements of Professor Bloomfield, I cannot help but feel the tempering quality of a smile, with which this intelligent and learned scholar would seem to mitigate the binding force of his statements. Mr. Hall, on the contrary, speaks always in dead earnest and seems to believe literally what he says. Accordingly, we must believe that linguistic behaviorism is a movement of cultural isolationism, a revolt of America against its European past. In order to combat the idea of One World, the idea of One Man must be rejected: man must be halved, bereft of his mind; in order to avoid foreign entanglements, one must be careful not to be snared by such labyrinthine European conceptions as 'soul' or 'mind' (the anthropogeography of Mr. Hall, the linguistic geographer, appears to me somewhat sketchy: does the alleged 'European' hostility against 'objective science' also obtain in Russia?). The true scholar of the future must conform to a stylized picture of 'the American' (we would say a caricature of the American): he must be youthful, active, 'progressive,' boastful, a 'holier-than-thou' nationalist, confident in figures and machinery, unmetaphysical, conformist and unsophisticated.

If "in American scholarship it is considered the utmost bad taste to inject one's personal religious beliefs into scientific discourse"² (while it

² It is all very well for Mr. Hall to state that "non-mentalistic procedure most emphatically does not involve, as a necessary corollary, disbelief in the ultimate existence of the human soul"—but what pusillanimous belief must that be which the scholar does not even act upon in carrying out his scholarly activities? The non-mentalistic acts on the simple premise that, since the human soul may lead us into error, we should have none of it in scholarship—as if scholarship, which is one way to the nobler and richer art of living, could be still called such when it is soulless, and, if soulless, would not have forfeited its right of existence (*propter vivendum vivendi perdere causas*). But our experience with the manner in which great discoveries have been made shows that the errors of speculation of which the human mind is susceptible are not altogether bad: it is a fact that most sound scholarly results have been found by a too ambitious scholar who overreached himself in his speculations: Schuchardt did not prove, as he sought to do, that *trouver* comes from *turbare* [*aquam*], but he has given us insight into the international terminology of fishing; Bédier did not prove that the *Chanson de Roland* is to be explained by the pilgrim road to Santiago de Compostella, but he has shown convincingly the unity of that poem; Pascal, perhaps, did not succeed in his proof of God's existence but, in his attempt to prove this, he had to discover the difference between the *esprit géométrique* and the *esprit de finesse*—which is what we call today the difference between naturalistic and humanistic thinking. As a friend of mine has worded it: it is those scholars that postulate results (provided they are scholars) who make the greatest discoveries. In order to establish a far-removed goal, they have

is evidently considered good taste to call the beliefs of others "folklore and superstition"), I must insist that it is even worse taste, even more un-American, to introduce jingoistic aspersions² into discussions of linguistic theories. Just how un-American reactionarism is to be defined depends upon the definition of what constitutes sound progressive Americanism; and Mr. Hall would evidently find it easy to exclude from American thought the philosophical school which has developed around the mathematician Whitehead, which has built up a metaphysics of its own (in one of his works, Whitehead goes so far as to posit God),⁴ and which may well foreshadow the American philosophy of the future. However much I may scandalize the aesthetic and national feelings of the *arbiter eleganti-*

to cement the avenues leading thereto, while those who proceed in limited space will ever move in a circle. 'Mentalistic errors' may be productive or they may not; 'antimentalistic orthodoxy' (what a contradiction in terms!) can never create.

² I do not happen to be a "latter-day follower of the 'idealistic school' of Croce and Vossler." My first book, "Die Wortbildung als stilisches Mittel," which contained in germ many of my later views, appeared in 1910, two years before Vossler's "Frankreichs Kultur"—though eight years, it is true, after Croce's "Estetica." In any case, I must confess that at the time I wrote my book I knew nothing of the two scholars named by Mr. Hall; I was primarily influenced by that great Viennese seeker into the meaning of human behavior, Sigmund Freud.

⁴ In his book "Science and the Modern World" (1926). I quote, from this and another work, certain passages of a 'mentalistic' tendency for the benefit of Mr. Hall:

It is easy enough to find a theory, logically harmonious and with important applications in the region of fact, provided that you are content to disregard half your evidence. Every age produces people with clear logical intellects, and with the most praiseworthy grasp of the importance of some sphere of human experience, who have elaborated, or inherited, a scheme of thought which exactly fits those experiences which claim their interest. Such people are apt resolutely to ignore, or to explain away, all evidence which confuses their scheme with contradictory instances. What they cannot fit in is for them nonsense. (p. 268, "Science and the Modern World.") Obscurantism is the refusal to speculate freely on the limitations of traditional methods. It is more than that: it is the negation of the importance of such speculation, the insistence on incidental dangers. A few generations ago the clergy, or to speak more accurately, large sections of the clergy, were the standing examples of obscurantism. Today their place has been taken by scientists—

By merit raised to that bad eminence.

The obscurantists of any generation are in the main constituted by the greater part of the practitioners of the dominant methodology. Today scientific methods are dominant, and scientists are the obscurantists. (p. 34-5, "The Function of Reason," 1929.)

Many a scientist has patiently designed experiments for the purpose of substantiating his belief that animal operations are motivated by no purposes. He has perhaps spent his spare time in writing articles to prove that human beings are as other animals so that "purpose" is a category irrelevant for the explanation of their bodily activities, his own activities included. Scientists animated by the purpose of proving that they are purposeless constitute an interesting subject for study. (p. 12, *ibid.*)

arum Americanarum, Robert A. Hall, Jr., I must declare that, when a scholar is convinced that religious beliefs do matter for linguistic scholarship, that the concepts of God and of the soul are correlative and interdependent, and that there is not possible or desirable any such partition of the scholarly mind which could yield a mechanistic technique divorced from belief—it is his professional duty to his public to say as much. Mechanists will continue to recognize only the mechanical in human language—which, unfortunately for them, is not only mechanical but, to an overwhelming degree, mental, nay aristocratic, and even theological: in a thousand years the French have not been able completely to eradicate the traces of the aristocratic 'h' of a Frankish aristocracy; the words designating 'God' have maintained in many languages a rock-like stability of form unshaken by the leveling forces usually effective in language (Sp. *Dios*, Rom. *Dumnezeu*, Russ. *bože*); in such examples it is the stability of meaning which has determined the phonetic stability. Moreover, the survival, in our languages, throughout the centuries, of traditions originally aristocratic and theological (needless to say, the Christian tradition was originally one of democratic humility, which only later arose to aristocratic stature) proves that they have come to be accepted by the people—a development which would not startle Mr. Hall if he would think of the aristocratic origin of the democratic structure of the United States (should we refuse to think of ourselves as 'citizens of the Great Republic of Humanity at large,' because the aristocratic Washington called himself so?). If, then, the scholar who deals with the (aristocratic-popular) European languages is not willing lightly to throw overboard his mental heritage "of medieval and Renaissance intellectualism," he may be moved not by social bias or snobbery but by his awareness of the fitness of his intellectual categories for the apperception of the phenomena he studies.

Finally, it seems to me quite gratuitous to argue that a scholar who is solidary with his heritage must be a social reactionary. Behind Mr. Hall's reasonings, which he means to limit to matters of linguistic scholarship, one seems to hear the familiar ring of Marxoid arguments which would leave us only the choice between the Kremlin and the Vatican, between the fight for man's right to material advancement and happiness and the fight for the rights of the soul. But, however difficult it may be in practical political reality for monomaniac humanity to reconcile the (ultimately harmonious) claims of the *civitas terrena* and the *civitas dei*, no such conflict need arise on the purely scholarly, contemplative plane on which linguistics moves. The human languages, those imperfect and temporal metaphysical systematizations by which (particularly in the case of the languages of civilized peoples) man has sought to orientate himself within the cosmos, those stammering attempts of the human mind at self-explanation, those metaphysical dialects or *vulgaria illustrata*, each of which strives toward, but never quite reaches, the perfect, supratemporal clarity, the Latinity (or mathematicity) of the divine language, belong definitely to that part of man that hails from the City of God.

LEO SPITZER

ZU GOETHE'S "KRIEGSERKLÄRUNG." Man mag sich durch E. Feises Ausführungen (*MLN*, 1946, 325) gern davon überzeugen lassen, dass das Lied "Hohn" in F. Tschischkas und J. M. Schottkys Sammlung "Österreichischer Volkslieder" (1819, nicht 1818 erschienen), Goethes "Kriegserklärung" näher steht als das von Erck nachgewiesene Lied. Es gibt aber noch eine andere Fassung dieses Volksliedes. Sie stammt aus Grein in Oberösterreich und ist mitgeteilt bei Heinrich Uhlandahl, *Als wir jüngst in Regensburg waren*, Berlin 1924. Die als Privatdruck veröffentlichte Schrift ist mir nicht zugänglich. Alfred Götze zitiert in seiner Besprechung (*Literaturblatt für germanische und romanische Philologie*, 1928, Spalte 105) daraus die erste Strophe:

Wenn i a so schön war
wie die Buabn in Landl,
haben gröne Hütel auf,
drauf rote Bandl.

Hier haben wir also eine Version, die im dritten und vierten Vers Goethes Gedicht fast so nahe steht wie das Ercksche Lied.

Goethes Gedicht ist 1803 erschienen, das von Erck mitgeteilte Volkslied stammt aus der Breslauer Liedersammlung von 1821, Heft 1. Viehoff hatte trotzdem angenommen, dass Goethe diesem Volkslied gefolgt, und dass nicht umgekehrt das Volkslied aus Goethes Gedicht entstanden sei. Andere, wie E. von der Hellen und A. Götze (*Das deutsche Volkslied*, Leipzig 1929, 93) waren dieser Ansicht beigetreten. Es gibt übrigens auch eine Volksliedmelodie zu diesem Lied; sie steht in L. Ercks *Kindergärtchen*, Essen 1843. Dagegen hatte Loeper, *Goethes Gedichte*, 1882, I, 278, gemeint. "Bevor nicht eine ältere Fassung jenes Volksliedes nachgewiesen wird, muss das Goethische als Quelle gelten." Diese Streitfrage ist durch Uhlandahls Nachweis erledigt. Das aus Grein überlieferte Lied ist für 1780 bezeugt. Feises Annahme, das Lied in Schottkys Sammlung habe den Anlass zu Goethes Gedicht gebildet, wird durch Uhlandahls Fund eher in Frage gestellt als bestätigt. Goethe kann ebensogut irgendeine andere Fassung gekannt haben, da offenbar damals mehrere im Umlauf waren. Freilich ist, soviel ich sehe, in keiner anderen der bisher gedruckten Volkslied-Sammlungen aus den deutschen und österreichischen Landschaften eine Fassung des Liedes enthalten.

KARL VIÉTOR

Harvard University

A NOTE ON LYLY'S *Midas*, II. In my previous discussion of this matter (*MLN*, LX, 326-7), I very stupidly attributed the invention of the notion of the cosmic egg to Rabbi Saadia ben Gaon; my subsequent reading has shown me how wrong I was. The idea, as I should have suspected, was of classical origin. An account of it appears in Achilles' *Isagoga* in Aratus (*Commentariorum in Aratum reliquiae* ed. Maass, Berlin, 1898, pp.

33, 37), in Eusebius' *Preparatio evangelica* (ed. Gifford, Oxon, 1903), p. 115b, and in Macrobius, 7.16.8-9. The latter two writers were well known to men of the sixteenth century and the *Isagoga* was printed in Renaissance editions of Aratus. Better still, perhaps, is the comment of Probus on Virgil's sixth eclogue, a comment that every schoolboy would know.

Ad quam imaginem Varro mundo ovum comparavit in Logistorico, qui inscribitur Tubero de origine humana, sic dicens: Caelum ut testa, item vitellum ut terra, inter illa duo humor quasi *ικμας* inclusus aer, in quo calor. (*Commentarius* ed. Keil, Halle, 1848, p. 19.)

There is also a reference to this figure in Plutarch's *Symposiacs*, 2.3 and in his *De placitis philosophorum*, 2.2, we read: *Οἱ μὲν Στωικοί, σφαιροειδῆ τὸν κόσμον, ἄλλοι δὲ κωνοειδῆ, οἱ δὲ ὠοειδῆ*, which would be enough to set Lyly off. The careful scholar could undoubtedly find a half hundred more places of this sort.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

HOUSMAN AND ISAIAH. Since Mr. C. E. Mounts mentions my name in his note in *M. L. N.* LXI, 1946, p. 186 in which he says that Housman's *More Poems* XXII. 1-3 contains a reference to Isaiah Lv. 1, perhaps you will allow me to remark that I anticipated this observation four years ago in *The Times Literary Supplement* of 18 April 1942, page 199, as could have been learned from page 222 of *The Year's Work in English Studies* for 1942.

G. B. A. FLETCHER

King's College,
University of Durham,
Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Encyclopedia of **LITERATURE**

Edited by **JOSEPH T. SHIPLEY**

THE culture of all the peoples of all times, as preserved in their literature or legends, is presented in over 100 major articles—from the most ancient records of the Egyptians, the oral tales of the Javanese and the American Indians, to the writings of today.

Each survey is written by an outstanding authority, many of whom were suggested or assigned by their country's Legation. In addition to the main surveys, there are brief discussions of the major literary figures of all languages and times, in alphabetical listing.

2 De Luxe Volumes, Boxed 1216 Pages **\$12.00**

20th Century **ENGLISH**

Edited by **WILLIAM S. KNICKERBOCKER**

A SELECTION of thirty-six essays clarifying and interpreting such issues as BASIC ENGLISH, SEMANTICS, THE NATURE OF SPEECH, LANGUAGE IN EDUCATION, REMEDIAL WORK, WRITING FOR THE PUBLIC, THE TEACHING OF COMPOSITION, LITERARY CRITICISM, Etc.

Among the contributors are S. I. Hayakawa, Archibald MacLeish, H. L. Mencken, John Erskine, Kenneth Burke, Oscar Cargill.

468 Pages **\$5.00**

UNUSUAL WORDS AND HOW THEY CAME ABOUT

By **EDWIN RADFORD**

"THE phrases and catchwords of which modern English speech is so largely made up are here traced to their origins in a more lively style than most lexicographers allow themselves."—*Daily Telegraph*.

"We are grateful to the author for the mass of information which he has collated on the origin of strange phrases and the colloquialisms which have been accepted in this country."—*The Library World*.

326 Pages **\$3.75**

LIMITED EDITIONS

At your bookstore, or order now from:



PHILOSOPHICAL LIBRARY, Publishers
15 East 40th Street, Dept. 138 New York 16, New York

On the Way toward its Third Million!

FRASER & SQUAIR SERIES of FRENCH GRAMMARS

The place of honor held by this series is readily seen in the total number of books used in schools and colleges during nearly half a century. For many teachers the original 1901 edition is irreplaceable to this day. Its lucid exposition of fundamentals, which has never been improved upon, accounts for the success of the various modern versions. The following list of current French grammars provides a choice to suit varying needs for specific types:

- (1) FRASER & SQUAIR: A French Grammar for Schools and Colleges (1901 ed.); (2) A Shorter French Course. (3) FRASER, SQUAIR & CARNAHAN: Brief French Grammar; (4) Standard French Grammar. (5) FRASER, SQUAIR & COLEMAN: New Complete French Grammar. (6) FRASER, SQUAIR & PARKER: Revised Elementary French Grammar; (7) French Composition and Reference Grammar.

D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY

SPANISH AMERICAN READINGS

Edited by

Willis Knapp Jones & Miriam Hansen

This is—frankly—an experiment in publishing. In 1941 Holt brought out an excellent collection of Spanish American Readings, and named it HISPANOAMERICANOS. Apparently no one liked the title—and it has been only by dint of constant suggestion by our sales force that readings and subsequent use of the book have been obtained.

Last year, in preparing a new edition of HISPANOAMERICANOS, Holt persuaded the editors to omit the first three selections—rather difficult materials—and substitute for them an excellent one-act Latin American comedy as the opening text, and another as the concluding one. "Con los nueve" by Caraballo, and "El viaje del provinciano" by Montesinos, are the titles of the new works.

HOLT NEW YORK • CHICAGO • SAN FRANCISCO